

THE  
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

JANUARY, 1867.

---

- ART. I.—1. LEYSER (P.). *Historia Poetarum Med. Ævi.*  
Hal. Mag. 8°. 1721.  
2. AMPÈRE (F.). *Hist. littéraire de France avant le 12<sup>me</sup> Siècle.*  
8°. Paris. 1839.  
3. DU MERIL (ED.). *Poésies inédites du Moyen Age.* Paris. 8°. 1854.  
4. DU MERIL (ED.). *Poésies populaires du Moyen Age.* Paris. 8°. 1847.  
5. DU MERIL (ED.). *Poésies populaires avant le 12<sup>me</sup> Siècle.*  
Paris. 8°. 1843.  
6. WRIGHT (J.). *Biographia Britannica Literaria.* Lond. 8°. 1846.  
7. MIGNE. *Cursus Patrologia Lat. &c.*

PART II.

[Continued from *Christian Remembrancer*, vol. lii. p. 392].

THE eleventh century opens under different auspices ; if it is still an age of coarseness and violence, an age in which the fair proportions of feudality are still being moulded and the noble grace of chivalry has not yet shone out in its full splendour, it is nevertheless an age with a purpose, and with an intellectual centre. To this day does the tourist who journeys from Rouen to the ancient town of Brionne, see, at the bottom of a long hill, about a mile from the latter, a lovely valley stretching out on his right hand, at the extremity of which rise the walls of a stately mansion, and one grey and lofty tower. Following the course of a swift clear stream flowing down through a winding lane, he will find himself, after a pleasant stroll, in the presence of what was once the illustrious monastery of Bec, the home of Anselm and Lanfranc, the intellectual centre of the eleventh century. But a change has come over that pleasant scene. The sloping hills, the sparkling stream, the woods waving in the summer wind, are still there, but the cloisters that rang to the feet of the solitaries have passed away, the scriptorium and the

transcriber have gone together; part has been rebuilt, part has perished by the work of time, and but a small portion of the original monastery now exists. And yet, in few other remains can be seen so clearly that gracious instinct which prompted the monastics to seek a resting-place among the loveliest of the works of God. No town has grown up around the venerable walls: no cottages even nestle under its shadow. It stands alone in the delightful valley among its murmuring leaves, as it stood in the days of Anselm: it still looks high over its green pastures and its undulating hills, to where, here and there among the woods, rises the grey tower of the village church.

It was on this spot, so calm and of a beauty so soft and tender, that in the year 1034 men laid the foundations of the great monastery of Bec. The fame of it grew up and flourished apace, and soon after the Italian Lanfranc was admitted within its walls, it rose to be the first establishment of its kind throughout the west of Europe. But into the long record of its renown it is not ours to enter. We follow but a single thread. We feel our way from age to age along only one slender line, and it is with Bec only so far as men wrote Latin verses within its walls, that we are here concerned. Who, then, in this age, was the foremost of its poets?

Anselm. The very name is in some sort an explanation of the age; it brings before us more clearly than any other its twofold nature, its inner and its outer life, its moral condition and its political features. In one sense, indeed, Anselm was the bold imperious churchman he has been so frequently described, but in another and far truer sense, he might be described as a man singularly gentle and mild, conciliating even little children by the suavity of his temper and his manners, and who, when his duty to the Church compelled him to vindicate her authority, was still loth to assert his own. Yet there was nothing in his nature of that humility which is akin to pride. He was perfectly sincere, when, as prior of Bec, he uttered a wish that he could throw aside the burden of government, and again become one of the brethren, and equally so in his unwillingness to exchange his priory for the English archiepiscopate. Had he been allowed to exercise a choice, there is little doubt he would have preferred a contemplative to an active life; but he was one of those men, who, though longing for retirement and tranquillity, are yet successful in the management of affairs. Above all things, he was a moralist. With the exception of a few controversial works, nearly all his writings were undertaken to solve certain difficulties, or to clear up certain doubts that had been propounded to him; but, besides his prose compositions, he was also the author of several metrical productions.



The longest and most important of these, written while he was yet at Bec, in spite of its somewhat ascetic title—'De Contemptu Mundi'—is distinguished by its unaffected piety, though its poetic merits can scarcely be insisted on. Addressed more particularly to his own monks, it is designed to shew them the happiness of their choice, by contrasting the peace and repose of the cloister with the brief pleasures and vanities of the world; and is in reality, a defence of the life to which he was himself devoted. After reminding them that the outward garment does not make the monk, he reminds them of the vows they have undertaken, solicits them to act always as under the eye of God, and passes on to consider the dangers incident to the various conditions of mankind. Kings, in their glory, are too apt to avert their eyes and forget their mortality, but their fortune is far from sure. The oak falls while the myrtle is left standing, the strong tower is shattered whilst the cottage is safe; their hearts are full of hesitation and dread, for, he adds almost in the words of Laberius, power that is feared by many, is itself in dread of not a few.<sup>1</sup> Thence passing on, he takes occasion to dilate on the ill effects of too great an attachment to life, on the worthlessness of splendid descent, and the idleness of bodily strength, and speaks at some length of the habit which, it seems, women had contracted of resorting openly to the monasteries for the purpose of receiving instruction. This practice he emphatically condemns: some of his lines, indeed, are remarkably ungallant; but he is induced, from speaking of women, to proceed to a consideration of the marriage state, and his view of this is fully marked by the asceticism of the time. He does not, it is true, condemn it, but observes that it is not for such as would aspire to perfection, and that those who have entered it cannot look to reap hereafter their sixty or a hundred-fold; but it must be remembered, that this not only was, but had been from remote times, the opinion of the Church. Monachism was the first virtue, to which all the others might be added, and without which they were not wholly inefficacious, but deprived of that which gave them their greatest value. The conclusion of the poem is simple and easy. After dwelling on the various vices and passions to which men are liable, he insists with great strength on the fragility and shortness of all human affairs, and ends by contrasting the peaceful humility of the cloister with the cares and temptations of the world. It is written in very indifferent elegiacs, and consists of some eight hundred lines.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'Non paucos metuit multis metuenda potestas.'—S. Anselm.

<sup>2</sup> 'Necesse est ut multos timeat quem multi timent.'—Laberius.

<sup>3</sup> Migne, tom. 158. The poem 'De Contemptu Mundi,' it should be observed, has been repeatedly published as the work of Anselm, though on unsatisfactory

Anselm wrote during the latter half of this century, and though a Lombard by extraction, resided either in Normandy or England; but though he may perhaps be taken as a representative of the age, it would be erroneous to speak of him as the best or purest of its poets. There was, in point of fact, very little difference between them, and that little consisted, for the most part, in their various degrees of barbarism. The best poem of the age, to speak of it from a classical point of view, was not the production of any of its recorded versifiers, but of an anonymous monk, probably of the monastery of Jumièges, who wrote a short metrical account of the foundation, destruction, and restoration of that establishment; and this little work shows a taste far more correct and cultivated than is to be found in more pretentious compositions.<sup>1</sup> Turn for a moment to the poems of Hermannus Contractus, or Hermann the cripple, a monk of the famous abbey of Richenau, a man who, in spite of his infirmities, was distinguished as a poet, a historian, a philosopher, a musician, a theologian, and a mathematician, and who lived during the first half of the century. They are very varied and numerous: they consist of lives of various saints embodied in songs (*cantus historiales*) for general circulation; of a book of lyrics on the eight principal vices, '*jocundulum*,' is the term applied to it by one of his friends; of a rhythm, celebrating the victory of Henry III. over the Hungarians, and of an infinity of hymns and sequences. These, with the exception of some fragments, are now lost, and the most considerable poem of Hermann is the '*Carmen de Conflictu Ovis et Lini*,' first published by M. Du Ménil in 1843:<sup>2</sup> but this belongs to a class so large and distinctive, that a few words on it are absolutely imperative. A few volumes, it may be added, would be insufficient to exhaust the subject, for its extent is enormous, and it increased with each successive generation.

From the most ancient times of Christianity, and indeed a far higher antiquity might be claimed, a large body of compositions had existed, treating both of religious and secular subjects, which were more generally diffused than those poems written in imitation of the classical models. While the great bulk of monastic poetry, more especially in the earlier centuries, had

authority. It has likewise been claimed for Bernard of Clugny, but, according to M. Wright, was written by Neckam, at the end of the twelfth or beginning of the thirteenth century. *Biogr. Brit. Lit. Anglo-Norman Period*, p. 452. Leyser, on the other hand, ascribes it directly to Anselm, p. 373.

<sup>1</sup> Migne, tom. 138. *Carmen de Monasterio Gemmeticensi*.

<sup>2</sup> *Poésies populaires avant le xii. siècle* par Edelstand du Meril, 8vo. Paris, 1843, and see also Muratori, *Antiq. Ital. Med. Ævi*, tom. iii. dis. 44. *Elogium Hermannii Contracti, ab ejus familiari conscriptum, anno 1054.*

been written mainly for circulation in the cloisters, there had always existed, though its beginnings are faint and small, a certain portion of it especially intended for circulation among the laity, and this portion is known as the popular poetry of the middle ages. It is impossible almost to describe its nature, for its nature was not only many-sided but universal. It concerned itself with everything. It was devotional, it was satirical,<sup>1</sup> it was commemorative—no subject and no event came amiss to its comprehensive activity. Religious in its earlier form, rehearsing perhaps a scriptural event, or perhaps taking the form of the hymn, it became rapidly developed, and at the beginning of the eighth century, was recognised as a separate branch of the poetic art, and possessed a particular form of versification.<sup>2</sup> Thus the two famous hymns, the 'Apparebit repentina,' and the 'Ad pereannis vitæ fontem,' attributed, though erroneously, to S. Augustine, who wrote nothing in metre save his hymn against the Donatists, may be taken as examples of its first phase, which gradually changed and grew, till in the ninth century it was indiscriminately applied to any matter of interest or curiosity. With political or military events, with the death or coronation of a sovereign, with a popular legend or a national hero, it quickly and closely became connected. One ballad laments the death of Charlemagne;<sup>3</sup> another celebrates the battle of Fontenay<sup>4</sup> (A.D. 841); a third is sung by the soldiers who are marching to liberate their prince.<sup>5</sup> It is grotesque, likewise, as witness that strange fragment attributed to S. Cyprian, and mentioned by Raban Maur, in which hundreds of scriptural characters are described as invited by God to a rich banquet, and engaged in the most absurd occupations—a fragment of almost Rabelian oddity.<sup>6</sup> It concerns itself with wild and fantastic imaginations, such as the 'Vision of Wettinus,' or those of Ansellus or Fulbert: it treats of saints, of heroes, of the fall of cities, and of the breaking out of wars. And, still later, it produces those admirable love-songs and drinking-songs, by which at the present day it is chiefly remembered. It forms, indeed, a striking proof of the truth of a remark that has been ventured on—namely, that the whole history of Mediæval Latin poetry is the

<sup>1</sup> Such, for instance, were the four hundred hexameters of Aldabaron, addressed to Robert of France. Hist. Lit. de la France, vii. 293, and a rhythmus satiricus on the times of the same monarch. Migne, 151.

<sup>2</sup> Du Meril, *Poésies populaires Latines antérieures au xiième siècle*. Introduction, p. 192.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 245.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 249.

<sup>5</sup> Muratori, *Antiq. Ital.* tom. iii. dis. 40. De rhythmica veterum poesi. Louis II., made prisoner at Beneventum, A.D. 871-2,

<sup>6</sup> Du Meril, *ubi sup.* p. 193.

history of its emancipation from theology.<sup>1</sup> Every successive century saw it enlarging its bounds, till, from being the mere amusement of the ecclesiastic and the recluse, it had grown to be almost the mirror of the age, and only succumbed to the rising languages of Europe.

To suppose, however, that the popular element was at this time of paramount importance, would be to fall into a grave mistake. The great bulk of the Latin poetry of this century was theological: the lives of saints still constitute its greatest portion. Of the fifty-four writers enumerated by Leyser, a large majority occupied themselves solely with this branch of their art, and if to these we add the writers of hymns, such as Peter Damian, or Fulbert of Chartres, or Alphanas of Salerno, it will be seen that its character was still religious and devotional. Nevertheless, and it is on this point we would particularly insist, the popular element had largely increased, and was already giving promise of the richness it was subsequently to attain.

The poem of Hermann, as may be judged from its title, possesses but little interest, being merely a wearisome dialogue between the plant and the animal, in which they assert their respective utility. Of greater importance, and indicating a branch of the art hitherto neglected, is the singular poem that bears the title of Walther, with regard to the date of which, however, great uncertainty exists.<sup>2</sup> At the first glance it appears to be an episode of one of the great cycle of poems which compose the Nibelungen Lied, but in reality it is an open and unblushing plagiarism. It borrows, in a word, its characters from the German poem, and supplies them with a different series of adventures. The Etzel of the Nibelungen Lied, as every one knows, stands for Attila: the author of Walther accordingly lays the scene at the court of that monarch. Hagen and Gunther are two of the doomed Nibelungen, and Hagen was formerly a hostage in the hands of Etzel:

Daher ist mir von Hagen auch Alles wohlbekannt.  
Zwei edle Kinder wurden ergozen hier im Land.  
Er und von Spanien Walther, die wuchsen hier zum Mann,  
Heim sandt' ich wieder Hagen; Walther mit Hildegund entrann.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Du Meril, *ubi sup.* p. 193.

<sup>2</sup> 'I have no hesitation in asserting that it contains internal evidence that it could not have been written before the end of the ninth century, and is probably attributable to the tenth or beginning of the eleventh.'—Herbert. *Attila*. p. 481. On the other hand, both Leyser and M. du Meril agree that Ekkehard, a monk of S. Gall, was the author, but differ as to the period at which he lived. Leyser places him about 1040, and M. du Meril somewhat earlier. Herbert is clearly in error when he says: 'It is supposed to have been written by a monk named Walther.' p. 540.

<sup>3</sup> Nibelungen Lied, xxviii. 1799.

In the Latin poem Hagans is a Burgundian hostage, who makes his escape; and Walther is likewise a hostage, who runs off with Hiltgunde. The adventures, however, are different, as will be seen from the following analysis, taken from the notes to Herbert's poem of Attila:—'Gibicho, who has an infant son, Gunther, 'is represented as King of the Francs near the Rhine. Hiltgunde, 'daughter of Herrie King of Burgundy, is betrothed to Walter 'Prince of Aquitaine. Attila with his Huns having advanced 'from Hungary against France, Gibicho submits to pay tribute, 'and gives Hagans as a hostage. Hiltgunde and Walter subsequently become hostages likewise, and Attila returns to his own 'country. But on the death of Gibicho, his son Gunther refuses 'to pay tribute, and Hagans makes his escape to him. Walter 'is successful in leading the Huns against them, performs other 'military services, and after refusing the offer of a wife among the 'Huns, proposes to Hiltgunde to make their escape. Attila and 'his court are invited to a banquet, and become intoxicated, and 'the pair, taking possession of much treasure and the King's 'favourite horse, set out together. Arrived at the Rhine, he 'pays the ferryman with a fish he had previously caught, which 'being presented presently to King Gunther's cook is recognised 'by him to be a foreign one; and inquiry being made, Walter is 'discovered. Gunther, together with Hagen and other warriors, 'pursue him to deprive him of Attila's treasures, and attack him 'in a cavern in the Vosges, where he is reposing. They are all 'slain save Gunther and Hagen, who at last fall upon Walter as 'he is endeavouring to retreat, and after a terrible encounter they 'all find themselves more or less mutilated. Walter loses a 'hand, Gunther a foot, and Hagen an eye; and the former goes 'on his way with his treasures.' The whole poem, then, is clearly written in glorification of a prince of Aquitaine, and the author, well aware of the popularity of the Nibelungen Lied, or rather of the cycle of poems it consists of, together with the Scandinavian myths on the same subjects, appropriates three or four of their distinguishing features. The hero, Walther, is represented as possessing himself of Attila's hostage Hiltgunde, elsewhere described as his wife, of his famous sword Gram, and his no less famous steed Geara, who here appears under the name of Leo; in short, he is invested with most of the attributes of the mythical Etzel. And besides all this, and the want of skill with which the story is managed, the form of the poem is barbarous to the last degree; it is crammed with Germanisms, and in some passages seems to have been a mere translation. Yet these are faults that might readily have been forgiven, had it contained any fragments of the true epic gold. Nevertheless, as an example of the increase of secular poetry, it is well worthy of

notice, whatever be the date of its appearance, and that we cannot pretend to determine.<sup>1</sup>

In Italy there was in this century a marked improvement, and especially in the latter portion of it.<sup>2</sup> At no period, indeed, even, as we have seen, during the invasions of the fifth century, had there been any dearth of metrical writers. In the eighth century there had been Paul the Deacon and Paulinus of Aquila; in the ninth, we meet with Theodolphus, Theophanius, Hilderic, Eschembert; in the tenth there was a retrogression, but in the present, owing in a high degree to the great pontiff who reigned at its commencement, the retrogression was more than arrested.<sup>3</sup> Schools, of which Italy had never been wholly destitute, now rose in all directions, and, indeed, the names of the more celebrated Italians of the age are quite sufficient to rebut any accusation of degeneracy. To omit the names of Hildebrand and Lanfranc and Anselm, we meet with Peter Damian, Alberic, Alphanus, Bonizo, Anselm of Lucca, Bruno of Segni, Leo Marsicanus, and Gregory of Farsa,<sup>4</sup> besides numerous others of inferior note. Of poets, however, none of these are equal, either in interest or importance, to the famous work of William the Apulian, written at the close of the century. Its subject—the conquest of Sicily and Apulia by the Normans, one of the most brilliant exploits in history—was admirably fitted to be the subject of a bold and heroic poem. The character of the great leader under whom it was effected contained precisely those features with which a poet would seek to invest the hero of whose exploits he sang. At once daring and wise, a prince far-seeing in design and eminently brave in battle, fertile in resources and prudent in council, the story of his marvellous conquest still possesses a romantic interest, and must have excited an interest incalculably greater in the minds of his contemporaries. All that was wanting was the sacred bard who could give life and grace and harmony to the rich drama that was unfolding itself on the Sicilian shores. The materials were ready to his hand. All the elements of a great poem lay in splendid confusion before him. He had merely to arrange, to bind in order, to select his illustrations, his similes, his incidents,

<sup>1</sup> It is clear, from expressions in the poem itself, that traditions on the subject had existed long anterior to it—

‘Quem referunt quidam Scaramundum nomine dictum.’—688.

Mention is also made of the famous smith Wieland—

‘Et nisi duratis Wielandia fabrica gyris  
Obstaret, spisso penetraverit ilia ligno.’—966.

<sup>2</sup> Muratori. *Antiq. Ital.* iii. dis. 44, p. 871.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* dis. 44 p. 913.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* dis.



to appreciate the poetry of the situation, to have produced a poem that might have equalled while it preceded by nearly four centuries the 'Gerusalemme Liberata.' The exploits of Robert Guiscard in Southern Italy were scarcely inferior to those of his nephew Tancred and his son Bohemond on the plains of Palestine. The battles of Civitella or Durazzo offered a theme, not indeed as inviting as the rescue of the holy city, but still, one around which a gorgeous web, in which truth was heightened into romance, might have been woven. The same Normans who stormed the walls of Jerusalem had already contended with the Moors in Sicily, and performed deeds but little, if at all, inferior to that crowning triumph. If, therefore, the poem of the Apulian is hard and dry, the fault is with him and not with the subject. The subject was all that could be desired: nothing but incapacity, dulness, or want of spirit, could fail to take advantage of a narrative peculiarly spirited and dramatic. If Camoens could produce a fine poem out of such unpromising materials as the voyage of Vasco de Gama, and the proceedings of his countrymen in the East Indies, it is not too much to expect that something will be made out of one of the most brilliant and romantic expeditions recorded in his history. But what is the work of the Apulian? A metrical chronicle, valuable no doubt, historically speaking, but no more a poem than the 'Historia Sicula' or the 'Historiæ Northmannorum.' No more insipid picture of a great event could easily have been given. He is, it is true, correct as to detail, but though that may make the narrative trustworthy, it is the very quality he ought as a poet to have rejected. There was no necessity for him to falsify history, but it is in the union of truth and fiction that one great charm of a poem consists. The enchantments of Ismeno were imaginary, but the forest in which he prepared them is standing at this day just where the poet described it. Aladin and Erminia were the creatures of his fancy, but the tower in which they are represented as sitting was most assuredly a tower built of mortar and stones. The paths trodden by Armida and Clorinda still wind round the sacred city.<sup>1</sup> It would be absurd, certainly, to expect from the eleventh century the grace and versatility that was in reality due to the full development of the feudal system and the restoration of literature in the previous age; but it is singular that a writer anxious to increase the honour of his patron's family, should not have exaggerated or drawn on his fancy. If his ambition only led him to record certain facts correctly in semi-barbarous hexameters, he might have been an excellent man; but it is idle to speak of him as a poet. He presents,

<sup>1</sup> Sismondi, quoting from Chateaubriand. *Literature du Midi*, i. p. 369.



however, a very curious picture of the age, and the general coldness of his style is itself worthy of observation.

A list of the writers who lived at any particular period is not very attractive to those unacquainted either with their lives or productions, but it would be fairly unpardonable to recapitulate a long series of forgotten names that only illustrate a semi-barbarous age. Of the fifty-four enumerated by Leyser—a number that may be considerably increased—the generality are so totally forgotten that nothing can render them an object of interest. It would be to no end were we to pass from the venal panegyrics of Benzo to the verses in which Guido Aretin explained his invention of the musical scale, to dwell on the lines in which the death of an abbot is lamented, or to commemorate the pious zeal that enshrined fictitious miracles in hexameters of strange construction. We prefer to turn for a moment, even at the cost of straying from the more immediate subject, to a short consideration of some matters connected with the age which eminently characterise its nature.

It is recorded by Gibbon, that in the first crusade the fourth division or *corps d'armée* of the pilgrims, composed chiefly of German peasantry, bore a goose and a goat before the vanguard, whom they regarded with superstitious veneration; and the very singular Decretals of Burchard, Bishop of Worms, who died in the year 1025, present a most interesting commentary on this singular conduct. Never were ignorance and superstition described and reproved with greater minuteness than in these curious pages. In Germany, at all events, in this age the old heathen traditions were not utterly dead: the relics both of Roman and Northern paganism are still to be met with in the daily life and customs of the people. Converted the last or nearly the last of the European nations, they retained later than most others traces of the practices from which they had been weaned, while the conflicting signs of Roman and Northern influence form not the least singular portion of the picture. Thus, for example, we find here the indications of the old belief in the transformation of human beings into the form of animals, especially the wolf, which is mentioned by the term popular superstition still bestows upon it,<sup>1</sup> and likewise of the fairies of mediæval tradition.<sup>2</sup> These were Northern, or at least German,

<sup>1</sup> 'Credidisti quod quidam credere solent, ut illæ quæ a vulgo paræ vocantur, ipse vel sint vel possint hoc facere quod creduntur; id est dum aliquis homo nascitur, et tunc valeant illum designare ad hoc quid velint ut quodcumque ille homo voluerit, in lupum transformari possit, quod vulgaris stultitia weruvolf vocat, aut in aliam aliquam figuram.'—Lib. xix. cap. 5.

<sup>2</sup> 'Credidisti quod quidam credere solent, quod sint agrestes feminae, quas sylvaticas vocant, quas dicunt esse corporeas, et quando voluerint ostendant se suis amatoribus, et cum eis dicunt se oblectasse, et item quando voluerint abs-

beliefs, but the practice of appeasing the Fates by exposing food for them in case they should pass by, seems to indicate a double origin. The three sisters must have come from classical antiquity, while the custom itself was common among both the Teutonic and Scandinavian nations, and prevailed, as every one knows, among ourselves.<sup>1</sup> In another passage, again, we meet with a very curious instance of the early belief in witches, and in their midnight revels, and it is so singular and suggestive of the origin of so wide a class of popular fancies, that we give it *in extenso* below.<sup>2</sup> A custom likewise that prevailed in times of drought is extraordinary, but will hardly bear translation,<sup>3</sup> while

---

condant se et evanescant? Si credidisti decem dies in pane et aqua poeniteas.'—Lib. xix. cap. 5.

It may be remarked that out of the twenty books composing these Decretals, one, the tenth, is expressly devoted to magical and superstitious practices; but of course, great portion of it is anterior to the eleventh century. S. Augustine, Bede, Isidore, Ambrose, and the councils of the eighth and ninth centuries are the chief authorities, but Burchard often speaks himself, 'Ad hæc,' he says after quoting his authorities, 'in Collectario hoc si quid utilitatis inveneris dei donis ascribe. Si autem quid superfluitatis mære insipientiæ deputa.'—Burchardus, Brunichoni suo. Migne, 140. Cf. Fabricius. Bib. Med. Ævi, ad nom.

<sup>1</sup> 'Fecisti ut quædam mulieres in quibusdam temporibus anni facere solent: ut in domo tua mensam preparares, et tuos cibos, et potum cum tribus cultellis supra mensam poneress, ut si venissent tres illæ sorores, quas antiqua posteritas et antiqua stultitia parcas nominavit, ibi reficerentur, et tulisti divinæ pietati potestatem suam, et nomen suum, et diabolo tradidisti, ita, dico, ut crederes illas quas tu dicis esse sorores, tibi posse, aut hic aut in futuro prodesse? Si fecisti,' &c.—Lib. xix.

<sup>2</sup> 'Credidisti aut particeps fuisti illius incredulitatis, quod quædam sceleratæ mulieres retro post Satanam conversæ, demonum illusionibus et phantasmatibus seductæ, credunt et profitentur se nocturnis horis cum Diana paganorum dea, et cum innumera multitudine mulierum equitare super quasdam bestias, et multa terrarum spatia in tempestæ noctis silentio pertransire, ejusque jussionibus velut dominæ obedire, et certis noctibus ad ejus servitium evocari!'—Ibid. And again in the same book—'Credidisti ut aliqua femina sit quæ hoc facere possit quod quædam, a diabolo deceptæ, se affirmant necessario et ex precepto facere debere, id est cum demonum turba in similitudinem mulierum transformatum, quam vulgaris stultitia holdam vocat, certis noctibus equitare debere super quasdam bestias, et in eorum se consortio annumeratam esse? Si particeps fuisti illius incredulitatis,' &c.—Ibid. De Arte Magica.

<sup>3</sup> 'Fecisti quod quædam mulieres facere solent? Dum pluviam non habent, et ea indigent, tunc plures puellas congregant, et unam parvulam virginem quasi ducem sibi præponunt, et eam denudant, et extra villam ubi herbam jusquam inveniunt, quæ Teutonice belisa vocatur, sic nudatam deducunt, et eandem herbam, eandem virginem sic nudam minimo digito dextræ manus erueri faciunt, et radicis erutam cum ligamine aliquo ad minimum digitum dextri pedis ligare faciunt. Et singulæ puellæ singulas virgas in manibus habentes, supradictam virginem herbam post se trahentem in flumen proximum introducunt, et cum eisdem virgis virginem flumine aspergunt, et sic suis incantationibus pluviam se habere sperant. Et post eandem virginem sic nudam, transpositis et mutatis in modum cancri vestigiis, a flumine ad villam inter manus redeunt? Si fecisti aut consentiens fuisti viginti dies in pane et aqua debes ponere.'—Ibid.

It will be observed that the three passages above cited bear upon female superstitution, a theme on which Burchard is exceedingly diffuse. It would be easy to multiply examples, but great part of his work turns on matters to which allusion is impossible. It is sufficient to say that he has omitted to reprobate no abomi

in another passage we come upon an exclusively Christian custom—that of singing the Creed and the Lord's Prayer while collecting medicinal herbs. This is enjoined as preferable to supposed incantations, but the habit of drawing a verse from Scripture, as from a lottery, and being guided by its nature is forbidden under penalty of a ten days' fast. Allusion is constantly made to philtres, charms, and incantations, to semi-pagan methods of observing New Year's Day, to fascinations, to scrolls covered with mystical characters, to household sprites,<sup>1</sup> and to usages touching the bodies of the dead. The pages of Burchard, in short, contain a full, and it must be added, unfavourable picture of the morality of the age, and fully sustain the censure that Mosheim and other ecclesiastical writers have bestowed upon it. Fraud and violence abounded in all directions. The history of the Papacy, the enormous pretensions of Hildebrand, the humiliation of the secular authority, offer the best commentary on the nature of the time. The century itself had opened ominously and darkly. The thousand years was supposed to have been consummated, the end was considered at hand, and all Europe was convulsed with the terrors of impending dissolution. But at its close it had assumed a brighter aspect. The new monastical societies were in the full vigour of their youth. Jerusalem had passed into the hands of the Christians. A splendid, though premature, civilization had arisen on the plains of Provence, which is still enshrined in the poems of Raymond and Berenger. England, fortunately for herself, had experienced the blessing of the Conquest. The age of the Cid had arrived in Spain. Everywhere round the intellectual horizon were the signs of promise and of progress: the world, to borrow the language of a great poet, was spinning down the grooves of change, and the dawn of a happier era was at hand.

Burchard, it will be remembered, lived during the earlier portion of the eleventh century, at a time when its worst features only were discernible, and it would, consequently, be incorrect to regard him as an exponent of its later condition. Anselm rather is the name to which we should turn as the representative both of its moral and intellectual life. The Eucharistic controversy excited by Berengarius, and the dispute between Anselm and Gaunilon,<sup>2</sup> on some doctrines of the former, contain ample proofs

nation that can be conceived by an ignorant and depraved woman. The Decretals may be recommended to those who believe in the dignity of human nature.

<sup>1</sup> 'Fecisti pueriles arcus parvulos, et puerorum saturalia, et projecisti sive in cellarium sive in horreum tuum, ut satyri vel pilosi cum eis ibi jocarentur, ut tibi aliorum bona comportarent, et inde ditior fieres? Si fecisti,' &c.—*De Arte Magica*, lib. xix. The Decretals of Burchard are in one sense one of the most abominable books that ever appeared, and it is strange that the objectionable portions are not omitted in the Collections.

<sup>2</sup> An account of this latter will be found in Maurice's *Mediæval Philosophy*, ch. iii. p. 102.

of its dialectical skill. Dialectics, indeed, and perhaps music, judging from the number of treatises upon it, were the two arts that peculiarly flourished, though both, in common with all others, were rapidly to develop in the succeeding age.<sup>1</sup>

A habit has been introduced by two distinguished writers, of selecting some one eminent man as the representative of his age, and of deducing an estimate of it from his life and character. This practice has many advantages, as it enables the writer to generalise largely, and at the same time to animate his narrative with biographical details; but it may perhaps be doubted whether it is historically correct. In point of fact, it is like reasoning from a particular to a universal. No one man, be he ever so great, can embrace in his own mind all the other minds of his age. No intellect can be so predominant as to overshadow the intelligence of the world. To take Alcuin as the representative of the eighth century, and Hincmar of the ninth, will no doubt be to give some interesting particulars concerning them, but will leave a great portion of the intellectual life of those centuries untouched; and just in the same manner, to take Bernard of Clairvaux, or Abelard in the present, would be to give a most imperfect idea of it. The great feature of the twelfth century is its astonishing richness and complexity. Life, that had hitherto flowed sluggishly along through a few ancient channels, burst suddenly into a hundred streams. In any other age Bernard, from his authority and character, would have assuredly had good claims to be regarded as its representative. But vast as was his influence, he forms in this but a portion of that marvellous activity that constitutes its life. There is Abelard, there is William of Champeaux, there is Peter Lombard, and Peter of Chigni, and Arnold Brescia, and each of these possessed a strong individuality. While authority clung round the feet of Bernard, philosophy emancipated herself in Abelard. Arnold would have destroyed the political fabric of the church, and converted Europe into one vast democracy. But in these men we have only the religious, the philosophical, the political elements of the time, and how vast is the residue of many-coloured and ever-varying life! The amazing influence of monastic life, the splendid fulness of feudality, a fulness whose meaning is to be seen in the cycle of Arturian

<sup>1</sup> The following short letter will give some indication of the price of books in this age. Circa an. 1057. 'Monachi cujusdam epistola ad Odericum Abbatem Monasterii Vindiciensis. Domino. suo abbati O. frater R. orationes in Christo. Pater carissime, scire vos volumus quod codicem de quo audivistis, pretio magno a Martino, qui est modo præsul, comitissa emit. Una vice libri causâ centum oves illi dedit: altera vice causâ ipsius libri unum modium framenti, et alterum sigalis, et tertium de millio. Iterum hac eadem causa centum oves: altera vice quasdam pelles martirinas. Cumque separavit se a comite, quatuor libratas, ovium emendi causâ, ab illa accepit. Postquam requisivit denarios, ille conqueri cœpit de libro. Illa statum demisit ei quod sibi debebat.'—Mabill. *Annal. Bened.* tom. iv. p. 574.

romance, or in the noble epic of Roland,<sup>1</sup> the gay songs of carousing students, such as those of *De Mapes* or *De Châtillon*, the rise of those singular tales subsequently so popular, and of which early indications are to be found in Peter Alphonse, the Crusades, the *Alligenses*, the jurists,—all this and these combine in forming its diversified features. No one man can represent such an age as this.

Though the century was thus marked by its wonderful fertility, it is not till the latter portion of it that any marked improvement can be discerned in its metrical literature. At its commencement the employment of rhyming Leonine verses was almost universal. Prosody was generally neglected; for in point of fact a new system of versification had gradually arisen, which, though in some degree based upon prosody, violated it at will, and had moreover rules peculiar to itself. These rules, which are exceedingly curious, will be found in the '*Labyrinthum*' of Everard de Bethune, a work written early in the following century, of which we shall have occasion to speak hereafter. Our object at present is to give a sketch rather of the contents than the form. Many readers may be interested in learning the subjects selected by these mediæval poets who would become speedily wearied with a dissertation on Leonines, cristate and accentual sapphics. Remarking then merely that at the commencement of this century the form was corrupt to the last degree, we hasten to give some conception, faint though it be, of the vast extent and diversity of the subject-matter.

In the opening pages it was remarked, that Christian Latin poetry naturally divided itself into four heads: that it was paraphrastic, legendary, controversial, and hymnic; which last division comprehended at that time its popular aspect. Let us now see under what heads it presents itself.

1. It is still legendary, it still concerns itself with the lives of saints, more or less apocryphal, whose virtues and miracles it celebrates. 2. It is likewise still hymnic: the hymn, in fact, has received its crowning glory, for we are in the age of Bernard of Clugny and Adam of Victor. 3. It concerns itself with military matters. A war now produces its poets. A whole cycle of poems relate to the Crusades. 4. In some instances it concerns itself with romance, as we have seen in the poem of Walther: it treats of the mythical Charlemagne, or the mythical Arthur, but sparingly, because here it had to contend with the romances of the vulgar tongue. 5. It devoted itself to popular songs and satire: it was amatory, bacchanalian, patriotic; it translated the vulgar songs and satires, such as that of '*Isengrim*' or '*Reinecke Fuchs*,' into the language of the cloister. 6. Its sixth division embraced those poems which treated of none of the above subjects, and

<sup>1</sup> First published by M. Francisque Michel from a manuscript in the Bodleian, in 1837.

which may therefore be called miscellaneous. To this class belong such poems as those of Hildebert of Mans, or the '*Liber Lapidum*' of Marbodius, or the epitaphs of Baudri, Archbishop of Dol, in Brittany. Now, a glance at this list will show the enormous progress that has been made in the secularization of mediæval poetry, for two of the old divisions,—the paraphrastic and the controversial, have fallen into desuetude, and have been supplanted by four others, all of which are independent of theology. It is of the last division we would at present speak.

The influence of monasteries and universities composes the two great facts that especially characterise the twelfth century; and the fruit of it is seen in the improvement that took place in education, and the zeal with which manuscripts were collected and transcribed. In France especially is this change visible. Her intellectual condition was the best in Europe. There are no names that can be compared with those of Abelard and Bernard, and Peter Lombard, for Peter, though an Italian, owed his education to Paris; but all these lived in the first half of the century. While, however, in the latter portion of the century prose literature showed symptoms of decadence,<sup>1</sup> verse on the other hand rapidly improved. Corrupt to a degree at its commencement, it was reclaimed from the barbarous forms into which it had fallen, and at the termination of the age had produced some of the best of the mediæval poems. The '*Architrenius*' of Hauteville, the '*Antiocheis*' of Joseph of Exeter, the '*Alexandreid*' of Walter de Châtillon were all written at the close of this century, or during the commencement of the following. But at the opening of the twelfth century, as we have said, poetry was universally corrupt, and even the best writers exhibited little promise.

Among these may be mentioned the name of Hildebert, Bishop of Mans, and subsequently Archbishop of Tours, who died in the year 1134, and who has left a large number of metrical compositions. Both in their form and subject these poems are exceedingly curious, and afford a very fair indication of the taste and spirit of the age. They are written, for the most part, in hexameters, but contain specimens of nearly every mediæval variety of it, though the great bulk is written in the ordinary rhyming Leonine, which was now generally used. The nature of these poems will be at once seen from the following list. First we have an elegiac poem, unrhymed, on the celebration of the Mass, on the ceremonial to be observed, and this is followed by a book in Leonine verse, in which he treats of the reasons for the ceremonial. Next in order stands a poem entitled '*Physiologus*'—if indeed it is to be ascribed to Hildebert—which consists of short detached pieces on various animals, written in a great variety of

<sup>1</sup> Eichhorn, *Allg. Gesch. der Literatur*, ii. 63.



metres; and next to this, again, we have a short poem in unrhymed elegiacs on the Creation. The 'De Ordine Mundi,' is a poem written in that variety of hexameter known as the *cristati*,<sup>1</sup>—the nature of which is seen below—a kind of 'abstract and brief chronicle' of the history of the world, and is in no sense a scriptural paraphrase, an assertion that cannot be made with regard to the poem on the First and Second Book of Kings, or to that on Ecclesiastes. The moral application of various passages of the Old and New Testament consists merely of little copies of hexameters, and the 'Book of Christian Inscriptions' is in reality a collection of epigrams, while the elegiacs on the story of Susanna present it simply with a little ornamentation. The lives of several saints, written for the most part in *cristati*, are in no way remarkable; but the very singular poems on Mahomet and on judicial astrology are well deserving of attention, as characteristic of the period.<sup>2</sup> In the former he commits the strange anachronism of making Mahomet a contemporary of Theodosius and Ambrose; and it is, moreover, laden with prodigies of all descriptions. The second is incomplete, and the end of the tale is consequently wanting, but it is in substance as follows. A soldier and his wife are residing at Rome, and the latter earnestly desiring to become a mother, consults an astrologer on the subject. The astrologer replies that she will bear her husband a son who will attain great distinctions, but who will eventually cause the death of his father. The prediction is fulfilled; the child is born, and the woman, desirous of saving it from her husband, to whom she had confessed the prophecy, sends it away, and has it reared elsewhere. The boy grows up, is a miracle of valour and intelligence, and after a career of astonishing triumphs, becomes master of the holy city, and at this point the narrative ends. Whether it was written, as hinted by the editor,<sup>3</sup> in ridicule of judicial astrology, or whether it merely embodied a popular tale, is perhaps an open question, but many stories of a similar nature were then current. The miscellaneous poems of Hildebert, consisting of pieces of verse of various length, in all kinds of metres, and on all kinds of subjects, complete the list: epigrams, epitaphs, epistles, rhymes, rhythms, are here crowded together in indiscriminate confusion.

From the preceding list some idea will be formed of the nature of the miscellaneous poems at the commencement of the twelfth

<sup>1</sup> The first two lines will give an idea of it—

'Maxime sanctorum sitiunt quem vota piorum  
Adventum cuius flex temporis exigit hujus,' &c.

<sup>2</sup> The 'Historia de Mahumete' is written in what are called *cristati* with a double rhyme—

'Heu quot sunt stulti miseranda fraude sepulti  
Contemtaque Dei cognitione rei!' &c.

<sup>3</sup> See Migne, tom. 171, p. 1366.



century, though some of them, such as the lives of the saints, fall under a different division. The contemporaries of Hildebert, who employed themselves likewise on these poems, greatly resemble him both in matter and style, but he surpasses most of them in the diversity of his subjects.<sup>1</sup> With the exception of Marbodius, or Marbœuf, Bishop of Rennes, there is not a single metrical writer during the earlier portion of the century who can compare with him in extent and variety; and Marbodius may, perhaps, be taken as representing only such subjects as had been omitted by Hildebert. Besides lives of the saints, and every one at that time wrote such lives, his works consist of '*Carmina varia*,' chiefly in Leonine hexameters; of a poem on Ruth, and another on Dinah, neither being paraphrastic, of a metrical version of some of the ordinary rules of rhetoric and grammar; of a poem on precious stones, in which their virtues and attributes are severally described; and of some books of what he terms capitularies, which are nothing else than short poems on various moral and religious subjects.<sup>2</sup> In these, as in the works of Hildebert, are to be found examples of almost every variety of mediæval metre; but it is perhaps worthy of remark, that such metres were, at least at this age, deliberately adopted. At the very time when Hildebert was perpetrating his hideous corruptions of the classical metres he was loading his pages with quotations from Virgil and Horace.<sup>3</sup> Sometimes indeed he tried to imitate them, but naturally without success. No one whose ear had been vitiated by the monotonous roll of the Leonine, who had manufactured his own words, and had been long accustomed to deal with his quantities as seemed good in his eyes, was likely to succeed. But it was choice, and not ignorance, that caused the continued use of mediæval versification.

It would be to no purpose to accumulate the names of the many other miscellaneous poets who flourished at this period, to mention the elegies of Laurence of Durham, the epigrams of Henry of Huntingdon, or the poems of Arnulphus, or Peter of Poitiers. It is clear that, with the exception of the popular branch, no class is likely to be more numerous than this. Miscellaneous verses are to be found scattered about in all directions, in the heart of theological disquisitions, in the midst of annals and chronicles,

<sup>1</sup> Among the *Carmina Miscellanea* of Hildebert, we have observed an epigram '*De Hermaphrodito*,' which is identical with the well-known one on the same subject attributed to Pulci de Costozza, and on the authenticity of which a treatise will be found at the end of the fourth volume of the '*Menagiana*.' There are several others of very similar nature among the poems of Hildebert, and it will be singular if these once famous lines were in reality written by a bishop of the twelfth century. Our own impression is, that they are older still.

<sup>2</sup> One of these '*De Fato et Genesi*,' is especially curious, as showing the belief of the time in astrology, and the influence of the natal Genius. Migne, tom. 171.

<sup>3</sup> See especially his '*Moralis Philosophia*,' which abounds in quotations from nearly all the Latin poets. Ibid.

and in the centre of philosophical treatises. Every one who could write at all could write the verses of the period, and the chances were that he did so. The extent, accordingly, even of this single class is enormous; it is so large, indeed, that we can do little more in these limits than indicate its magnitude.

In turning to those poems that especially commemorate military exploits, a sensible difference prevails. Their number is comparatively scanty, and necessarily so; for it is one thing to throw off little copies of verses on incidental occurrences, and another to attempt a prolonged flight. The fashion, however, of celebrating warlike events in poems of considerable length, was not one that arose in this century. We have seen it in the concluding years of the last in the poems of William the Apulian; and indeed, in one form or another, matters of this nature had always found their way into song. The novelty was in the form and the extent. It was important, not in itself but in its results. The older poems of this description were the ancestors in a right line of the remarkable cycle of heroic poems that appeared at the close of this and the beginning of the subsequent century. Since the days when Abbo had told, in uncouth verse, of the Normans beleaguering the walls of Paris, a predilection for this species of composition had been growing up, and the time of its maturity was now at hand. The 'Alexandreid,' the 'Ligurinus,' the 'Antiocheis,' the 'Philippis,' all sprang from a common source, though their appearance was owing to the great improvement in taste and knowledge of Latin that is discernible at the close of the age.

The opening years of the present century present us with several specimens of these poems during their earlier development, and among the most conspicuous of these is that of Laurence, a deacon at Verona. In seven books of hexameters he has described the exploits of the Pisans in the Balearic isles, and their triumph at Pisa in the year 1215. Many of his descriptions are spirited and well-drawn, but he is on the whole more of an annalist than a poet. His work is a chronicle thrown into verse: events are narrated just as they occurred, without any attempt to heighten or adorn them. It consists of seven books of hexameters and contains about three thousand lines. In the same class must be placed the poem of Gilo of Paris on the First Crusade, in six books of Leonine hexameters—a barbarous production, abounding in exaggeration and credulity, and utterly unworthy of the subject. One Fulco, or Foulques, has likewise left a poem on this crusade.<sup>1</sup>

If length were any indication of merit, it must be confessed that some of the poems of this age would be of a very high

<sup>1</sup> Both these are to be found in Duchesne. *Hist. Franc.* tom. iv.

order. Those of Alanus de Insulis<sup>1</sup> extend over a hundred and two quarto pages, closely printed: the four books of Ægidius on the composition of medicines contain over four thousand five hundred lines:<sup>2</sup> the 'Aurora' of Peter de Riga, a painful metrical paraphrase of the entire Scriptures, is apparently limitless.<sup>3</sup> But all these lived at the close of the century, and, remembering the improvement which is said to have taken place, it is not unreasonable to look for some evidence of it in their writings. Ægidius however, and de Riga, may be dismissed at once. The subject on which the former wrote, involving the necessity of using the semi-barbarous terms of the pharmacopœia, precluded the probability of elegance, while the poem of Riga, though curious in many respects, is unavoidably monotonous. Far superior to both are those of Alanus. His 'Ante-Claudianus,' a phantastic title taken from the exordium and in no way indicative of the nature of the poem, possesses great merit, and his other productions are pleasing and harmonious. That he has blemishes is of course unavoidable, but he is on the whole the most correct of the poets we have yet met. But whatever his merits in this particular, he was speedily eclipsed. The rapid though temporary restoration of learning that occurred at the close of the age, can be traced step by step in the verses of the successive poets. Alanus himself made an advance, but Alanus is overshadowed by the great superiority of the 'Architrenius.' The 'Architrenius,' in point of versification alone, is perhaps excelled by the 'Enteticus' of John of Salisbury; but both are inferior to the great poems of the succeeding age, to the 'Ligurinus,' the 'Antiocheis,' and the 'Philippis.' The improvement that is manifested in so many directions is undoubtedly apparent in the redemption of the classical metres from the barbarous fashion that had defaced them, and the consequent aspect of Latin versification.

John de Hauteville, or de Alta Villa, a monk of St. Albans,

<sup>1</sup> In the Prolegomena to the works of Alanus, or Alain de l'Isle (Migne, tom. 210), will be found an investigation into the period in which he is said to have lived. But the two persons of this name are there identified, whereas Alanus, bishop of Auxerre, died about 1185, and Alanus de Insulis (according to this account) in 1203. The old opinion was, that he died in 1294. Cf. Fabricius, Bib. Med. Ætat.

<sup>2</sup> Ægidius, or Giles de Corbell, said to have been a Greek by birth, was a monk of the abbey above named, and physician to Philip Augustus: see Millman, Latin Christ. vol. iv. p. 69. The medical poem referred to is to be found in Leyser, p. 499. There were many individuals of the same name, and among others a descendant who corrected and interpolated the 'Aurora' of Peter de Riga, and who was also the author of a poem called 'Carolinus.' Cf. Fabricius, Bib. Med. Ætat. ad nomen. Migne, tom. 212. A more correct distribution would perhaps have assigned Ægidius to the following century, though the matter is of little moment.

<sup>3</sup> Peter de Riga was a canon regular in the abbey of S. Denis at Reims, and wrote during the latter portion of the century. Migne, tom. 212.

who wrote during the concluding portion of the century, was the author of the 'Architrenius.' Its nature is in some degree explained by the title, but it scarcely conveys its general scope. In reality, it is a long poem in nine books of hexameters, partly on the miseries of human life and the moral condition of mankind, partly satirical; for he glances with a keen eye on the vices of the age, and at the same time alike descriptive and imaginary. In other words, it is a vast metrical *mélange*, into which the writer threw his meditations and fancies, without troubling himself about the coherence of his work. But its prevailing tone is one of mournful resignation. Looking out from his cloister into the world, the old monk was saddened and perplexed at the spectacle. The oppression of nobles and the hypocrisy of priests strike him with horror and alarm, and he records them with indignation. At another time, averting his gaze from the world, he busies himself with a popular legend, or a passing thought, or a passage from a favourite author. His work thus possesses a personal character which belongs to few other mediæval poems. Rarely in them does the author himself appear. A few lines at the commencement or conclusion perhaps indicate his name and the time in which he wrote. But here, on the other hand, the object from first to last is to develop the thoughts and aspirations of the individual, and a result hitherto unattained is consequently witnessed. The poem, though long since utterly forgotten, was once widely popular, and is repeatedly quoted by Camden in his 'Britannia.'<sup>1</sup>

Belonging to the earlier portion of this century and to this country, we meet with a very curious poem on a subject hitherto but scantily touched on by the mediæval bards. The poem of Walther, as we have seen, was in reality a translation from the great cycle of legends, which subsequently assumed the form of the 'Helden Buch' and the 'Nibelungen Lied.' And just in the same manner the poem now alluded to was a translation, or at all events was derived from the great mass of Armorican legends that concerned themselves with the fortunes of Arthur and Merlin. The metrical life of the latter is commonly supposed to have been written by Geoffrey of Monmouth, who died about the middle of this century, though its authenticity seems open to doubt.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Archithrenii (Joannis) Neustrii seu Normanni, Poemata. 4to. (Paris, 1517. The following headings, taken at random, will give a fair idea of its nature. 'De Naturæ Potentia—Exclamatio in Gulam—De Miseriis Scholasticorum—De Astro nomia—De adulatoribus Aulæ—De casu Luciferi—De conceptione Arthuri—Verba Archytæ de Ira—De ortu Signorum—Oratio Archithrenii ad Naturam—De studio Nocturno—De monte Ambitionis,' &c. It is far from a common work at the present day. The exact date of the poem was 1184. Wright, Biogr. Brit. Lit., Anglo-Norman period, p. 250.

<sup>2</sup> Vita Merlini attribuée à Geoffroy de Monmouth, par Francisque Michel et

It consists of 1525 lines (hexameters), which frequently rise above mediocrity, though at the same time exceedingly unequal: its contents are briefly as follows.

Merlin, king of Dermetia, in alliance with his brother-in-law Rodarch (Rodareus), king of Cumberland, are introduced, engaged in a battle with Gwendolan, king of Scotland, and in it the three brothers of Merlin are all slain. Inconsolable at their loss, he retires into the forest of Calidon, and broods over his sorrow till he becomes insane. In the meantime his sister Ganiada, who is the wife of Rodarch, despatches a minstrel in search of him, with whom he is induced to return, but, soon wearying of the court, becomes anxious to retire again to his forest. Rodarch refuses and has him bound in the hall. At this moment the queen enters, and the king observing a leaf clinging to her hair, removes it, on which Merlin, still insane, bursts into laughter. Being at last promised his freedom if he will explain his hilarity, he is kind enough to remark that the queen had just returned from an interview with her lover in an arbour that was strewn with leaves, and he was laughing at her reception. The queen, after the manner of women, is in no want of an ingenious defence: she observes that Merlin is hopelessly insane, and to prove him so desires him to say by what death one of the pages will die. The wizard answers, and the boy subsequently returning twice in different disguises, receives on each occasion a different reply.<sup>1</sup> After a display like this of his skill, the queen is admitted to her husband's confidence, and Merlin, notwithstanding the entreaties of his sister and his wife Gwendolena, retires again to the woods. Perceiving however, after some time, from the aspect of the stars, that the latter is about to marry again, he determines to provide a nuptial present, for he was in no way particular, and accordingly he collects a herd of deer, which he drives to the palace. Unfortunately for himself, the intended bridegroom is sitting in the gateway, and being amused at the personal appearance of his predecessor, is so injudicious as to laugh at him. The outraged wizard, wrenching off a horn of the stag he was riding, instantly threw it at him, and to use the expressive language of the original—'*caput ejus penitus contrivit*,' and the unhappy wretch expired. He now endeavours to return to the forest, but is made prisoner and brought again to the

Thomas Wright, 8vo, Paris, 1837. Mr. Wright is of opinion that it is later than the time of Geoffrey, the bishop Robert to whom it is dedicated being Robert Grostest.

<sup>1</sup> He replies successively that the boy will die by falling from a rock, by drowning, and by being caught among the boughs of a tree. The prophecy is at last fulfilled: the boy is thrown from his horse off a rock into a river, but his head only is in the water, his body being arrested by a bough. This is the same conceit that the epigram alluded to on page 17, turns on.

court of Rodarch. Again, however, by explaining the meaning of mysterious fits of laughter, he is allowed to depart, but this time an observatory is constructed for him in his retreat. Here he is frequently visited by his sister, but after some years he suddenly desires her to send him the famous bard Taliessin, who had just returned from Armorica. Taliessin arrives, and the rest of the poem is occupied with the conversation of the two worthies on various wonderful and mysterious matters, among which the adventures of Arthur are not neglected.

Now in this poem, if indeed it belongs to the age, we have not indeed a new element introduced, but a striking example of its growth. There is indeed no great reason for astonishment that a Welchman or a Breton, whether of the twelfth or thirteenth century, should choose to celebrate any portion of the Arthurian legends. It was exactly the time when they attained their greatest popularity. It was the age when Chrestien de Troyes recited them in his metrical romances. It was the age when Alain de l'Isle wrote that whoever should venture in Brittany to deny that Arthur was still living would infallibly be stoned; where, he asks, is that hero unknown? where from Asia to Britain are his deeds not famous? The point to be observed is this—a branch of literature which, in its origin, was exclusively theological, is now completely secularized. Ecclesiastics no longer think it necessary to devote themselves entirely to sacred matters. A new spirit has arisen, which sees in all directions and in all subjects matter for harmonious treatment. Men, instead of regarding the classical masters with aversion, now make them their diligent study. And as to the extent and variety of the matters treated of, the reader has only to turn to the popular poetry of the age.

Among the countless divisions of this branch, those poems which held up to execration or derision the founder of Mahomedanism were widely circulated. Not content with representing him as a sorcerer, a libertine, a camel-stealer, an heresiarch, a cardinal who, disappointed of the Papacy, established a new religion, and as the Antichrist predicted of old, a mass of legends was invented to render his person odious, and his religion contemptible. Hildebert, as we have seen, inserted a portion of them in his poem against him, though without much judgment in his selection, and a monk named Walter, probably Gualtier de Marmontiers, who wrote during the century, likewise assailed him.<sup>1</sup> His poem, consisting of over a thousand uncouth elegiacs, though curious, deserves mention rather as showing the influence of the crusades than as possessing merit of its own,

---

<sup>1</sup> Du Meril, *Poésies populaires Latines du Moyen Age*, p. 369.



but it was nevertheless exceedingly popular. Nearly a century later a version of it was given in French by Alexander du Pont—a decisive proof of its success.

Of a different class are such poems as the 'Alda,' attributed to Guillaume de Blois, but possibly the production of Matthieu de Vendome,<sup>1</sup> the 'Comœdia Lydiæ,' certainly his work,<sup>2</sup> and the 'Paulinus and Polla,' though this is of later date. These are perhaps most easily described by saying that they were popular tales, originally the property of the jongleur or the trouvère, thrown into a metrical form for the entertainment of the cloister. In this age such tales had a wide circulation. The returning Crusaders brought back with them innumerable legends of Eastern origin, while at the same time, omitting entirely the romances of chivalry which were a branch by themselves, the idle industry of the monks was continually employed in the composition of such tales, or in translating them into a Latin form. They were, as may be supposed, of widely different character. Some embodied a jest, others a moral, and others again were grossly licentious. The 'Alda,' for example, just mentioned, turns on an incident not eminently delicate—on the incident on which Louvet has founded his scandalous romance, and which Byron has described as occurring in the harem. The 'Comœdia Lydiæ,' again, is an early form of the ninth story related on the seventh day of the Decameron, and is likewise introduced by Chaucer in the 'Merchant's Tale,' but is best known by Pope's version of it in January and May. Partly similar to these, which it must be remembered constitute a wide and important class, are the popular apologues and fables; and these are so numerous and of such antiquity that they constitute a distinct branch of learning. Without recurring to the names of Æsop or Phædrus, or Babrius, it is sufficient to remark that throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries they were received with favour by all classes, they are to be found both in Latin and in the vernacular,<sup>3</sup> and what is of more importance, they began to be used as political weapons. At what period, for example, the German apologue of 'Reynard the Fox' was first invented, it is impossible to say; but it was during the present age that it was first used as a vehicle of attack upon monastic institutions. The 'Isengrimus,' the production of a Flemish priest, appeared during

<sup>1</sup> Du Meril, *Poésies inédites du Moyen Age, précédées d'une histoire de la Fable Ésoopique*, p. 421, where it is given. For his miscellaneous poems, see Wright and Halliwell. *Reliquiæ Sacre*, vol. ii. 257.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 350.

<sup>3</sup> *Fables inédites des xii<sup>e</sup>, xiii<sup>e</sup>, et xiv<sup>e</sup> siècles*, par A. C. M. Robert, 2 tom. 1825. See the 'Essai sur les Fabulistes qui ont précédé La Fontaine.' Fables are found in many of the writers of this age, e.g. Peter Alphonse, Alain de Lille, Neckam, Geoffroi de Vinesauf, John of Salisbury, &c. Neckam indeed composed a collection of fables, his 'Novus Æsopus,' as also did one Baldo. Du Meril, *Poésies inéd.* p. 213.



the first half of the century, and was followed by another Latin poem of similar nature entitled 'Reinardus.' And just in the same manner numberless others were circulated, more or less satirical in their tendency, but by no means to be confounded with the general mass of them that adhered to the legitimate object of the fable.

Now, throwing these two classes together, we have a most important element in mediæval poetry. Taking the 'Alda' as representing metrical tales, of whatever nature, and the 'Isengrimus' as representing the fables, whether moral or satirical, a large proportion of it is at once displayed. Of the two, the tales, at least in a literary sense, are the more significant. It was from them that Boccaccio borrowed so many of his stories, and that so many books, of which the 'Liber Facetiarum' of Poggio may be taken as the type, were subsequently compiled. But on the other hand the metrical fables, and especially those that bore a satirical impress, were of more political importance. An allegory which represented an abbot as one beast of prey, and a feudal chieftain as another, and which did not spare even dignitaries more exalted, might well be regarded as a storehouse of offensive weapons. Besides, however, these political fables, there was a vast class of poems which, without being in the least allegorical, were professedly satiric. To these nothing was sacred. Pope and potentate they alike treated without fashion or respect. There are many poems of this age which would not have been out of place in the convulsions of the sixteenth century, and of which, in point of fact, the reformers made more skilful use, and to these our own countrymen largely contributed.

We have used the term popular mediæval poetry, and attempted to point out some of its principal divisions; but it is so vast and varied in its nature, that it is scarcely susceptible of accurate classification. It concerned itself with whatever was said or done among men; with their vows, their fears, their anger, and their pleasures, with their wanderings and with their triumphs. And this is at first sight the more astonishing, when it is remembered that at this time the modern languages were rapidly growing in wealth and power. What they were even now capable of doing may be seen in the noble poem of 'Roland'—a poem which many are disposed to rank above the 'Nibelungen Lied.' But, on the other hand, the Latin language continued for more than four centuries to be the means of intercommunication among the learned; and the poems that were now written in it were popular, more especially in the monasteries or among ecclesiastics, or in the castles of the better instructed among the laity. There was, therefore, a large audience for these ephemeral productions. They were a portion of the entertainment of every one who understood the Latin tongue. The Mysteries, on the other hand, and the

Miracle-plays were for the populace. The very extent in fact of the popular Latin poems, and the multifarious subjects they embraced are a sufficient proof of their prodigious circulation. No work was yet written without hope of securing the appreciation of others.

Among the satires alluded to may be mentioned those of Gautier de Châtillon, the author of the 'Alexandreis,' for a long time attributed to Walter Mapes. These satires, which are exceedingly virulent, are for the most part directed against the court of Rome; indeed their nature may be collected from the fact that many of them were subsequently published by Flacius Illyricus. The poets of this age had invented an imaginary personage whom they termed Goliath, in whose name many of their attacks were couched. 'A certain parasite of our time,' says Giraldus Cambresis, 'Goliath by name, infamous alike for scurrilousness and gluttony, tolerably educated indeed, but ill-governed and without due discipline, has again and again vomited forth numbers of infamous songs both in metre and rhyme against the Pope and the Roman court.'<sup>1</sup> But under the name of Goliath many different individuals were comprised. It was a mere mythical appellation, which, like Pasquin, belonged neither to one time nor one country. Like Martin Marprelate, it was a nickname that covered a very decided object. In these satires, then, of De Châtillon, he attacks ecclesiastical abuses with a really Protestant vigour; he does not scruple to speak of the Pope as Antichrist, and of the bishops as stained with the sin of Gehazi; and asks in what region or under what constellation there is a bishop or an abbot worthy of the cross. The depraved condition of the clergy, again, is a constant theme of lamentation and invective; and the fiercest of these are generally written in the name of Goliath. But the writers of these satires by no means confined themselves to attacks upon the Church, or rather its disorders; they scattered their ridicule with a more liberal hand. Society itself, with its complexity of customs and classes, was not safe from their merriment or indignation. Though by no means insensible of the charms of love,<sup>2</sup> Goliath is rendered furious at the idea of marriage, against which he pours out many brutal and ribald verses.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, besides the satires that directly assailed the vices of the hierarchy and those written on general topics, such as the wickedness of the age, a vast number were composed on particular occasions, such as the death of an unpopular abbot, or some act of oppression by a bishop or a noble. These, it may be remarked, had existed from a remote time; but

<sup>1</sup> Wright, Latin poems commonly attributed to Walter Mapes, p. xxxviii. and Du Meril, *Poésies pop.* p. 144. Milman, *Latin Christ.* ix. p. 189.

<sup>2</sup> See the 'Confessio Goliath' in the poems attributed to Walter Mapes.

<sup>3</sup> *Chanson contre le mariage.* Du Meril, *Poésies populaires Lat.* p. 179.

the poems that are written in the name of Goliath did not appear till the close of the twelfth century, and more strictly belong to that which followed it. As for those for which De Châtillon is answerable, he, it may be observed, was living between the years 1160–1200, and in all probability for some years after that time. His ‘Alexandreis’ was clearly written before the close of the century.<sup>1</sup>

Belonging to a different class, but equally popular, were the Latin songs and ballads. Among these, those of Abelard, of which but a few fragments now remain, were perhaps the most widely known, for both he and Heloise speak of them as circulating in many different localities.<sup>2</sup> Amatory poetry, indeed, is of all others the most generally diffused, and throughout the middle ages formed an important portion of their rhythmical literature. In it, as in the other divisions of the popular poetry, the rhyme was almost always employed, and was carried to a very great degree of refinement; indeed, more pleasing and ingenious rhymes were never written. No modern rhyming Latin, except, perhaps, that scattered through the very entertaining ‘Reliques of Father Prout,’ approaches them in smoothness and harmony, and, however unclassical the practice may be, it is impossible to deny that they have a beauty peculiarly their own. Besides, however, the love-songs, Latin ballads exist on a great variety of subjects. Sometimes they take the form of a lament, as on the death of a prince or great man, and sometimes they celebrate a victory or a popular hero. The joys of drinking are a favourite topic, patriotism is not neglected, no event indeed and no subject came amiss to them. They commemorated every shade of many-coloured life.

There are yet a few poets remaining who wrote at the close of the age of whom we would speak ere we conclude our task. Of these, two were the authors of heroic poems, de Châtillon, Provost of the Canons of Tournay, whose satires have been just mentioned, being the author of the ‘Alexandreid,’ and Joseph of Exeter, of a poem on the Trojan war. Of his ‘Antiocheis,’ a fragment only has been preserved by Camden.

The ‘Alexandreis,’ as its name imports, celebrates the conquests of the great Macedonian, and is founded on the narrative of Quintus Curtius, consisting of ten books of heroic verse, in which the manner of Lucan is successfully imitated; it was the most ambitious effort that had been yet made, and attained an amazing popularity. The author was spoken of as rivalling the most famous poets of antiquity, and for years after his death it

<sup>1</sup> It was dedicated to Guillelmus, Archbishop of Reims, 1176–1201. Fabricius Bib. Med. Lat. and Warton.

<sup>2</sup> In their letters.

continued to be read as a class-book in the schools of the Continent. Yet, though extravagantly extolled, it undoubtedly possesses great and peculiar merits. It would have been better, certainly, had the poet endeavoured to form himself on the Virgilian model; but, having his eye on Lucan, and probably Statius, he has succeeded in catching, with great felicity, much of their spirit and tone. Here and there, indeed, a very barbarous line is discoverable, but his similes are especially excellent, while in narration he is frequently spirited and picturesque. The arrangement of the circumstances displays considerable art, and on the whole the general aspect of the work is greatly superior to any that had hitherto appeared. Warton speaks of it as far transcending the merits of the '*Philippis*,' a poem that did not appear till thirty years later, but that is precisely the period when Latin verse began to retrograde. Whether it excelled the work of Joseph of Exeter, which appeared nearly simultaneously, is a question the reader must decide for himself.

Joseph of Exeter, whom Mr. Wright terms the best of our mediæval Anglo-Latin poets, dedicated his poem on the Trojan war to Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, and it was most probably written in the year 1184. In matter it is only a paraphrase of the fabulous history that was circulated during the middle ages under the name of '*Dares Phrygius*,' but is composed with great elegance and purity, and, at the restoration of letters, was first printed under the name of '*Cornelius Nepos*.'<sup>1</sup> The style, according to Warton, is a mixture of Ovid, Statius, and Claudian, the classics then most popular, and exhibits a great command of poetical phraseology. It perhaps approaches more nearly than any other to the pure taste of the classical ages; but, from the few manuscripts in which it is found, it appears, from some cause, not to have attained immediate popularity.

There were four eminent Latin poets, of whom three were Englishmen, who were writing at the close of the twelfth century, and who continued to write during the opening years of the succeeding age. Their names are Geoffrey de Vinsauf, Alexander Neckam, Nigellus Wiriker, and Everard de Bethune. The first is the author of a long book of hexameters, entitled '*De Nova Poetria*,' and was dedicated by the author to Innocent III. It is a metrical treatise on the art of metrical composition, containing examples and illustrations of the rules it inculcates. It opens by giving general rules for versification, and proceeds to consider in detail the measures to be taken to bring a work to perfection. The arrangement must first be determined on, and, when that is settled, great care must be taken

---

<sup>1</sup> Wright, *Biogr. Brit. Lit.* p. 403.

as to the amplification and adornment. On this point he dilates at great length; it occupies, indeed, the greatest portion of the work. It is, however, a heavy, tiresome poem, and is only interesting as being the key to the general style of the Latin poetical writers of the thirteenth century, which was formed on its rules. They are sometimes good, but as often in bad taste, and well calculated to produce the inflated and meretricious style of writing which too often marked the writers of the succeeding age.<sup>1</sup> His name is now only kept alive by the ridicule Chaucer has thrown on his exaggerated lines on the death of Cœur-de-Lion.<sup>2</sup>

Alexander Neckam, the foster brother of that monarch, was born at St. Albans, in 1157, and died in 1217. He passed his boyhood in that town, receiving his education in the Abbey school, and, while still extremely young, was appointed to the direction of the school at Dunstable. This office, however, he soon resigned, for, in the year 1180, we find him spoken of as a distinguished Professor at the then famous university of Paris, where he had attached himself to the school of the Petit Pont. He continued there till the year 1186, when he returned to England and resumed his position at Dunstable, but soon after joined and ultimately became Abbot of the Augustinian monastery of Cirencester.

His most important work is a long treatise, '*De Naturis Rerum*,' which has been lately edited by Mr. Wright; but, besides this, he was the author of a long elegiac poem on the praises of Divine Wisdom, of which we find the following analysis.

The poem '*De Laudibus Divinæ Sapientiæ*' is a metrical paraphrase of the treatise '*De Naturis Rerum*,' with some considerable additions, and with the omission of most of the stories. It is divided into ten books, which are called, according to a fashion then in vogue, and adopted by Giraldus Cambrensis, Walter Mapes, and other writers, distinctions (*distinctiones*). In the first of these Neckam treats of the creation, of heaven and the angels, and of the stars, planets, and constellations, and other celestial bodies. In the second distinction he treats of the four elements, which, as in the prose treatise, are the foundation of his system of natural philosophy; and taking air as the first of these, he proceeds to treat of birds as belonging especially to that element. The third distinction treats of water, and of the various phenomena connected with it; and he here gives an account of fishes, and an enumeration and description of the

<sup>1</sup> Wright, *Biogr. Brit. Lat.* p. 398. The poem itself is to be found in Leyser, p. 862.

<sup>2</sup> *Canterbury Tales*. The Nonnes Preestes Tale.

principal rivers in the world, and especially those of France, Great Britain and Ireland, with the chief towns situated on their banks. The fourth book is devoted to the subject of fire, the third element, and to various natural phenomena, such as winds and storms, the weather, the relations of the elements to each other, &c. In the fifth book Neckam treats of the earth, and of its various countries, giving long and rather interesting accounts of their principal cities and towns, including an enumeration of some of the wonders of Britain, among which we may note his account of Stonehenge. The sixth book proceeds to the interior of the earth, and describes its metals and the gems and precious stones, with their natures and wonderful qualities. The seventh distinction contains a much fuller list of plants than we find in the prose treatise, and defines their various qualities and medicinal virtues. The eighth continues this subject, and treats of fruit trees, the plants which produce grain, &c. The ninth is devoted to the natural history of animals, including man. The tenth and last distinction treats of the seven arts, and of science in general, subjects which are here treated much more briefly than in the treatise '*De Naturis Rerum*.'<sup>1</sup>

Besides this poem, however, there were others of Neckam, which appear to have been lost. He was perhaps the author of that on monastic life which has been mentioned under the name of Anselm, and in Leyser a list of some five or six compositions on miscellaneous subjects is to be found. On the whole, though his place lies more properly among the general scholars than the Latin poets, his verses are frequently marked by their ease and correctness, and to borrow the language of Mr. Wright, often rise above the mediocrity of the age. But this is perhaps rather a hard judgment. All these mediæval poets must be considered relatively to their age, and when their age certainly surpassed any that had preceded it, it is a little unfair to insist on its mediocrity. Absolutely considered, it was certainly mediocre; relatively, it exhibited, indifferent as it may have been, an advance and an improvement.

In a dictionary of patrology lately published, the following concise notice of a very curious old writer of this age is to be found.<sup>2</sup> 'Nigellus Wireker, a writer of the twelfth century, attempted satire with some success, and although an Englishman by birth, had studied at Paris. His '*Speculum Brunelli*,' or

<sup>1</sup> Alexander Neckam. *De Naturis Rerum, et de Laudibus Divine Sapientiæ*. Published under the authority of the Master of the Rolls. 8vo. Lond. 1863. Edited by T. Wright, Esq. Preface, p. lxxv.

<sup>2</sup> Dictionnaire de Patrologie, par l'Abbé A. Sevestre. Migne, Nouvelle Encyclop. Theol. tom. 23.



'*Speculum Stultorum*,' is an invective against the corrupt manners of the clergy of his age. He makes it apparent, from certain traits of malicious observation, that nearly all those who came to study at Paris, returned to their own country with the reputation of men of learning, but without really being so.' If the manners of the clergy were corrupt, as it seems they were, it is hardly clear how it could be malicious to observe them; while, if all the foreigners who studied at Paris returned with an undeserved reputation for erudition, the truly erudite must have been exclusively French. The crime, however, of Wireker was not his want of learning, but his impertinence in ridiculing abuses. The greater the familiarity with the writers of the Roman Catholic Church, the more clearly is it to be seen that they never pardon an author who has assailed what even they admit to be its disorders.

Nigellus Wireker was præcentor in the Church of Canterbury, and the intimate friend of William de Longchamp, the famous Bishop of Ely during the reign of Richard I. Many minor poems of Nigellus are to be found in the Cottonian Library, but the best known of his works, and so far as we are aware the only one that has been published, is the satire above mentioned. From the very curious edition of it which appeared at Cologne during the last year of the fifteenth century, and which is now before us, we will attempt a slight outline of its contents.<sup>1</sup>

The ass, Brunellus, type of the eternal and unreasonable cupidity of the monks, is dissatisfied with the length of his tail, which he is persuaded is out of proportion with his ears, and accordingly applies to the physician Galienus to assist him. The physician replies that it is not easy to do, and that moreover his tail is sufficiently long—a truth he inculcates by a ridiculous story of two cows, who on one occasion had their tails frozen into the ground. Finally, however, finding argument in vain, he dismisses him with his blessing, and despatches him to Salerno, there to obtain the needful drugs. At Salerno, however, Brunellus fell into the clutches of a certain merchant of London, and was induced to purchase ten jars of rubbish (*plena nugis*) of him, with which he sets out on his homeward way. But at Lyons he meets with a great misfortune, for the dogs bite half of his tail off, and he is captured by a Cistercian monk, whom he is lucky enough afterwards to thrust in the Rhone. Subsequently, making his way to the neighbourhood of Paris, he is

<sup>1</sup> *Liber qui intitulatur Brunellus in speculo stultorum*. 4to. Col. 1499. It contains numerous quaint engravings representing the events of the tale. It is not, however, the first edition, as there are two anterior to it.



induced to study there, and makes the acquaintance of Arnold, an English student, with whom he enters the town. Here he remains for nearly seven years, associating chiefly with the English students; but gathering little benefit from his studies, he resolves to go either to Rome or Bologna. On his way, however, he thinks seriously of becoming a monk, and reviews consecutively the various orders, his estimate of whom is far from flattering. Neither the Carthusians, the Cistercians, or the Templars are satisfactory; the regular canons are still worse, and the secular canons immeasurably wicked. He thinks, therefore, of founding an order of his own. He will have the horses of the Templars, the dispensation of the Cluniacs to feast on Friday, the warm hoods of the Præmonstratensians, and, like the Carthusians, he will have only one mass in a month. But on his way to Rome to procure a confirmation of his order, he encounters his physician Galienus, and whilst busily persuading him to enter it, is seized by his owner, Bernhard. Delighted to regain the animal that had strayed, Bernhard slits his ears, and employs him in his business. And thus ends this quaint and curious legend. Slight and grotesque as it may now appear, it undoubtedly contains a severe satire not only on the ecclesiastics, but on the whole character of the age.<sup>1</sup>

But one other writer of this period, or rather of the earlier portion of the thirteenth century, remains to be mentioned, and it is on account of a very singular list of poets contained in his work. Everard de Bethune, the author of two poems entitled respectively the 'Græcismus' and the 'Labyrinthus,' probably wrote the latter after the year 1212, and it purports to describe the inconveniences to which the teachers of that age were exposed. But in the third division of it he speaks of such poems as were commonly read in the schools, and it must be confessed that they are sufficiently varied. We have Cato,<sup>2</sup> Theodulfus,<sup>3</sup> Avianus,<sup>4</sup> and Alsop, and next in order to these stand Maximianus, Pamphilus,<sup>5</sup> and Geta,<sup>6</sup> who are followed by seven of the classical poets. To these succeed the names of Alexander,<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The following lines of Nigellus contain a very profound moral truth, uncounted as they are:—

Contemptum proprium qui ferre potest patienter  
Cætera de facili sustinuisse potest,  
Omnia cum soleat victrix patientia ferre:  
Victa sub hoc onere succubuisse solet.'

<sup>2</sup> That is, the moral distichs attributed to him.

<sup>3</sup> A poem on the miracles of the Old Testament.

<sup>4</sup> The fables of.

<sup>5</sup> That is, 'Pamphilus De Amore,' of which there are many editions.

<sup>6</sup> The 'Amphitrio' of Plautus.

<sup>7</sup> The 'Alexandreid' of de Châtillon.

Dares,<sup>1</sup> Homer, Salimarius,<sup>2</sup> and Macer,<sup>3</sup> the enumeration concluded by the most famous names in the list of strictly religious poets, such as Prudentius and Arator. By way, however, of illustrating the subject more fully, Everard has inserted, immediately after these names, a long metrical treatise on the principles of versification, which contains examples of the various forms and modifications applied to it, such as *cristati* or inverted *leonines*. We are, consequently, presented in this passage, not merely with a list of the poets who were then popular, but with the general form and aspect of the Latin poetry of the age. The list, of course, is far from exhaustive, and indeed other names are impliedly mentioned; but it is nevertheless sufficiently large to indicate the extent and variety of the mediæval schools.

Taking then this catalogue as a base, let us look for a moment at the divisions into which poetry had fallen at the commencement of the thirteenth century. The supplement to it can be drawn from independent sources.

In the first place, men are now conversant with the ancient models: the best of the classical poets are familiar to them. It is true, as we have attempted to show, that there never was at any time an absolute ignorance of them. Even in the darkest ages there had always been a privileged few to whom the volume of the past lay open. But this has now ceased to be the privilege of the few, for in all directions we meet with signs of their popularity, and of the respect with which they are regarded. For one man who was acquainted with them in the tenth century there were ten at the end of the twelfth, or the beginning of the thirteenth, and the fruit of the intimacy was quickly made manifest. Admiration always leads to imitation. There never was a great writer yet but a whole shoal of copyists endeavoured to catch his style, and mimic his ideas. The first thought of an artist, when he looks at a master-piece, is the possibility of equalling or excelling it. Just in the same way men's acquaintance with Virgil and Lucan led them to imitate what they so ardently admired. There had been a tendency for many years to write long poems in heroic verse—a tendency clearly shown in poems such as those of William of Apulia and Laurence of Verona, and the increased knowledge of the classical poets heightened and determined it.

Thus, while the poets of antiquity formed by themselves a dis-

<sup>1</sup> The poem of Joseph of Exeter, '*De Bello Trojano*,' founded on the prose version of Dares Phrygiæ, is probably meant.

<sup>2</sup> Gunther, the author of the '*Ligurinus*,' had previously written a poem, which he called '*Solymarium*,' on the war in the Holy Land.

<sup>3</sup> The genuine work of Macer on herbs and birds is lost, but throughout the middle ages, a work was current under the title of '*Æmilii Macer de Herbarum Virtutibus*,' of which there is an old translation.

finest portion of the metrical literature of the age, they in a great measure led to the appearance of the cycle of heroic poems, which, in their turn, constituted one great branch of mediæval Latin poetry. It was, as we have seen, of late origin. Military exploits indeed had in all ages been commemorated in song, but it was not till the twelfth century that the fashion prevailed of making the achievements of a modern prince the subject of an epos.

That description of poetry which, though not strictly devotional, may yet be designated religious, contributed in a large measure to the current and increasing literature. The poems of Prudentius, of Prosper, of Arator, had never been lost sight of, and their number was now swelled by a host of similar or inferior productions. Each century, as it passed away, left behind it a vast metrical deposit connected more or less with theological matters. The fruit of monastic or episcopal leisure, it was for the most part either paraphrastic or controversial, and as an adjunct, or rather a correlative branch, possessed the great division of ritualistic or devotional poems which constitute the hymn. But the hymn was a class apart: it had its own forms and laws of composition, and was written expressly for public worship. And not only was it the earliest metrical effusion of Christian piety, and indeed of apostolic origin, but it is the one branch of mediæval poetry which has descended to our own days, and which is still employed in the services of the Catholic Church. The religious poems, therefore, and the hymns compose two distinct though cognate divisions of the Latin poetry of this age; the latter, indeed, was now brought to the highest perfection that it has ever attained. It will be observed, however, that Everard in his enumeration has made no mention of the hymns, and, in point of fact, has omitted several of the distinct branches of the art.

Amongst those, on the other hand, which he has recorded, or rather to a portion of which he has alluded, are the more especially popular poems of the age. The names of *Æsop*, of *Avianus*, and of *Phisiologus* point in reality to that wide and curious division of mediæval literature comprehended under the name of *Bestiaries*,—short tales or apologues in which animals are introduced. These now had a great circulation, and a little later were applied to a very different purpose. *Vincent*, of *Beauvais*, writing about the middle of the thirteenth century, tells us that the monks and preachers were in the habit of moralizing the popular fables and stories, and that it was the fashion to quote *Æsop* from the pulpit. Sometimes they drew a moral from the jest or anecdote of the day; sometimes they chose the *fabliaux* and poems of the minstrels, and sometimes they abridged the plots of the romances. The more popular the fable or tale the more suited it was to their

purpose, for the more readily could they arouse the attention of the congregation. Half the freedom of language, and the quaint and almost irreverent turn of thought and expression that is so often observable in mediæval sermons, is due to this habit of familiar illustration. But these fables, or beast tales, are only a component part of the general mass of popular poetry. They are but one of its many divisions. Its nature, as we have seen, was almost universal. Satire, love-song, drinking-song, war-song, or dirge, it expressed the emotions and celebrated the customs of many men and many lands.

The metrical legends or lives of saints, and what we have ventured to call the miscellaneous poems, complete the sum of the Latin poetry which existed in Europe in the earlier portion of the thirteenth century. The former carries with it its own explanation. Any abbot who was eminent for his piety, and especially if he happened to be the founder of a monastery, was certain to find some versifier to record his life and his miracles. The latter embraces a vast variety of poems on subjects independent of each other, which scarcely rank with the popular division. Metrical treatises, for example, on philology or medicine, on herbs or on precious stones, partly compose it. A large portion, again, consists of metrical chronicles. Short poems on religious subjects, epigrams, epitaphs, copies of verses written for some particular occasion, constitute in fact its greatest bulk.

Casting our eyes back for a moment to the period of our commencement, we can now see the progress that has been made. In the time of Prudentius, and for more than five hundred years after his death, Latin verse was almost exclusively theological. It was written only by ecclesiastics, and consisted but of a few great and simple divisions. Its tone was hard and harsh, and marked by a painful uniformity. There was no warmth, no colouring, no vividness or energy of expression: its form was angular and stiff; it was utterly destitute of animation and grace. Turn to it now, as it exists in the thirteenth century, and how vast and astonishing is the change! What richness and diversity! what ease and power of expression! Its whole character and spirit have altered. It has lost that air of severity, that sombre and prolix devotion to theology: it is many-sided, versatile, plastic; it embraces all subjects; it presents itself under many aspects; it is, in a word, the mirror in which the age is reflected. There is still, doubtless, a strong theological element in it; but the theological is not, as in the fifth century, the only element prevailing. For generations it has been growing more and more secular, till at last it has thrown off the old ecclesiastical trammels, and while preserving a portion of its original character, has enlarged its sphere and diversified its matter. Whereas formerly it contained

only paraphrases of Scripture, legends of saints, hymns, and a few poems of controversial theology, it now concerns itself with the whole round of human life. There was in this age a great forward movement in the minds of men, and even Latin verse was carried up with the tide.

It was the age when Christian architecture was carried to a perfection that has never been excelled, that Gothic cathedrals rose in all parts of Transalpine Europe. It was the period when art was beginning to throw off the yoke of Byzantinism, and prepare for independence, when the era of Cimabue and Giotto was close at hand. Corrupt as were the older monastic societies, it was the time when the exigencies of the Church called aloud for defenders, and the great Mendicant Orders answered to the appeal. It was the time when, south of the Loire, in the loveliest of all lands, an infant civilization had arisen, distinguished by its rare refinement, but destined to a swift and mournful end. It was the time when chivalry had attained its full perfection in the stern school of the Crusades, and its features were caught and reflected in rich and marvellous romance. It was the age, likewise, in which the ancient models were diligently studied, and a truer sense of antiquity prevailed.

In an age, then, so brilliant and promising as this, it is surely not strange that this particular description of poetry should, like all other branches of art, show signs of improvement. The influence of the age on it indeed can be distinctly traced. The rhyming Latin poems, the songs and the satires, are the direct expression of feudal taste. Their full-sounding and accumulating rhymes, rolling up into a volume of sonorous music, are to the Virgilian hexameter what the Gothic cathedral is to the Roman temple. In the hexameter and in the temple, dignity is attained by means of simplicity: in the rhyme and in the cathedral it is attained by elaboration of ornament subordinated to unity of effect. The epics, on the other hand, if they may be termed so, are the direct result of the newly-awakened admiration for antiquity. Feeble and imperfect as they may be, they have but little in common with their own age: they are in no sense the expression of mediæval taste, except so far as it was retrospective. The hymns, again, are the full and direct expression of monastic piety. Their form is essentially Gothic. To read them even in the silence of the closet, is as if a man stood in some vast cathedral while the storm of music was raging through the aisles, and the sunset fell in crimson and gold through the blazoned windows.

This fortunate age was not fated to be of long continuance. From the latter part of the twelfth to the middle of the thirteenth century may, perhaps, be called the golden age of mediæval Latinity. After that time there was a sensible decline in all the

Transalpine countries. Philology was neglected, rhetoric was despised, verse relapsed in utter barbarism, scholastic philosophy was all in all. It was not till long after, when the days of the *renaissance* had arrived, that Latin verse was not only restored to what it had been in mediæval times, but attained a purity and a splendour of which mediæval times had no conception.

And here we must arrest our course. It has been our object rather to give a broad and general sketch of the chief features of ecclesiastical and monastic verse than a long catalogue of names and works. But so vast is the magnitude of the subject, and the number of matters with which it is connected, that it is scarcely possible to do it justice in an essay. Until, however, some work of authority appears on the subject, those who would learn aught of its nature, but must be content either to give many hours to the perusal of many volumes, or trust to attempts as imperfect as our own.

---



ART II.—*The collected Writings of Edward Irving.* In five volumes. Edited by his nephew, the Rev. G. CARLYLE, M.A. London: 1864-5.

MORE than four years have elapsed since we reviewed Mrs. Oliphant's 'Life of Edward Irving.' The interest which that book, by its graphic and truthful portraiture, revived in the great Presbyterian preachers, called up in the minds of many, yet living, vivid recollections of his eloquence, and aroused a desire in many more to possess his works. Though a large portion of his writings had been published in his life-time, and some of these had passed through several editions, there did not exist either an uniform edition of what Irving had published, or a complete collection of what he had written. It appeared, therefore, proper to the possessors of his literary remains, to put forth such an edition as should answer both requirements of uniformity and completeness. We are consequently indebted to the Rev. G. Carlyle, Irving's nephew, for this series of five handsome and portly octavos. How far these volumes answer expectation as to completeness or judiciousness of selection, we shall see as we go on. At any rate, no higher tribute could be paid to the power of Irving's intellect than the publication of these volumes. For Irving was no safe and sound divine whose theology any man, who cared to be thought orthodox, would openly admire. He wrote no work upon any subject of lasting interest extraneous to theology. His style of sermon composition was in every sense inimitable. No one could hope to come up to it in its excellencies, or would attempt to follow it in its peculiarities. Therefore, in publishing his discourses, the expectation that they would find a sale amongst the starveling preachers of our time, who hunger and thirst after new volumes of sermons, could have had no place as a motive. And yet, in the absence of all these which form the usual reasons for reproducing the writings of a deceased author, who was neither a novelist nor a poet, the well-known publisher, Mr. Alexander Strahan, has deemed it wise to put forth a large and elegant edition of his works. And we doubt not the public have duly appreciated the venture. That it should be made, and that it should succeed, now that Irving has been dead above thirty years, is, we repeat, a noble testimony to the force of his genius.

As the object of the present article is to trace the progress of

Irving's mind and the development of his views, we shall, as far as may be practicable, follow the chronological order of his writings, referring occasionally to his life for information that may throw light upon his mental history. And here we regret to be obliged to find fault with the editor at the very outset of his work. The first volume begins with a series of four discourses, ranged under the title 'On the Word of God.' They are not introduced by any preface of the author, or accompanied by any note of the editor; and there is nothing to tell whether they are now printed for the first time or not. Moreover, there is nothing to show what place they take in the chronological arrangement of Irving's writings. Consequently, if we did not happen to know something about them, beyond what Mr. Carlyle tells us, we should remain in perfect ignorance of the fact—a fact of great importance, as bearing upon Irving's theological and intellectual history—that these four discourses are the famous 'Orations' which, together with the 'Argument for Judgment to Come,' formed Irving's first published work. This volume, as we learn from Mrs. Oliphant ('Life of Edward Irving,' vol. I. p. 169), at once aroused public attention to the highest degree of interest and excitement. Of course it is the part rather of the biographer than of the editor to relate these facts, more especially as this edition of the work professedly follows in the wake of the 'Life.' But while we may accept this as an apology for the total absence of any note of explanation, there is no excuse left for changing the title under which Irving issued his first book, and by which it has ever been known as one of the most brilliant efforts of theological rhetoric. 'For the Oracles of God, Four Orations;' this was the title with which Irving headed his work: 'On the Word of God;' this is Mr. Carlyle's feeble and unauthorised substitute. But this is not all. Doubtless Mr. Carlyle, when he undertook the task of producing a collected edition of his uncle's writings, had to decide with much deliberation upon the limits he should assign to it so as to avoid, on the one hand, an unsaleable voluminousness, and, on the other, an incomplete exhibition of the author's views and genius. We accept with approbation the principles he lays down for himself in his preface, in these words. 'It is now proposed to make such a collection of his writings as will fairly exhibit his great powers of oratory and thought. It will be the Editor's object to include whatever is of permanent interest, to omit only what may neither throw light upon Mr. Irving's convictions, nor possess an independent value. We demur, however, to the manner in which he has carried these principles out. In the case of the 'Orations' he has shorn them of the preface and the dedication to Dr. Chalmers,

both which pieces are of great value,—the preface for containing Irving's reasons for entering upon the field of theological literature, the dedication for the affectionate and reverential feelings with which he regarded his quondam master. (We may observe, in passing, that Mrs. Oliphant makes the mistake of calling the Dedication the Preface). But Mr. Carlyle's editorial fingers have an itch for paring down: not satisfied with mutilating the title and expunging the author's introductions, he cannot even let the orations themselves appear in the dress in which Irving himself sent them forth to the world. He must needs clip off the Scriptural motto with which they were originally ornamented: John v. 39, 'Search the Scriptures.'

With regard to the omission of the preface, the editor certainly may state, as a justification for the act, that it stands related to the whole contents of the volume,—to the latter and larger portion, viz.: 'For the Judgment to Come—an Argument in nine parts,' as well as to the former portion, the 'Orations;' and that as he thought fit only to include the Orations in his edition, it would have been incongruous to have reprinted a preface which referred, not only to the small portion inserted, but also to the large portion excluded. Here, however, we only find additional cause for objection. We think the fact of Irving's sending forth to the world the two treatises, the 'Orations' and the 'Argument for Judgment to Come,' as one work bound together under one common introduction was a powerful reason which ought to have deterred his editor from severing them; and the fact of the preface applying to both should have induced Mr. Carlyle to reprint both, not to omit the preface. And we think that the following extract from the said preface will establish the correctness of our opinion. In fact, in view of this omission we consider that Mr. Carlyle ought to amend his title page, and call the book the *selected*, not *collected*, writings of Edward Irving.

'Moved by these feelings, I have set the example of two new methods of handling religious truth—*The Oration*, and *The Argument*; the one intended to be after the manner of the antient Oration, the best vehicle for addressing the minds of men which the world hath seen, far beyond the Sermon, of which the very name hath learned to inspire drowsiness and tediousness; the other after the manner of the antient Apologies, with this difference, that it is pleaded not before any judicial bar, but before the tribunal of the human mind. The former are but specimens; the latter, though most imperfect, is intended to be complete. The Orations are placed first in the volume, because the Oracles of God, which they exalt, are the foundation of the Argument, which brings to reason and common sense one of the revelations which they contain.'

But apart from these external reasons against the omission, the 'Argument for Judgment to Come' has strong internal

claims to be included in a collection of Irving's works, which professes as this does, 'to exhibit fairly his powers of thought,' and 'to throw light upon his convictions.' As Irving deemed fit to publish the 'Orations' (which Mr. Carlyle has accepted), and the 'Argument for Judgment' (which Mr. Carlyle has rejected), in one book, we shall take the liberty of treating them as such; and our readers will probably be glad to learn from us, what the editor has refused to inform them, about the scope and character of Irving's first essay in literature.

The 'Orations' are four in number,—the first treats of the 'Preparation for consulting the Oracles of God;' the second, of the 'Manner of consulting the Oracles of God;' the third and fourth dwell upon the same subject, viz.: the 'Obeying of the Oracles of God.' What we have to say concerning Irving's style of composition we reserve for the close of this article. Meanwhile we will draw attention to salient points in the writings themselves.

The first oration is taken up partly with censuring the imperfect, erroneous, and irreverent receptions given to God's written Word by the generality of men; and partly with laying down the tone, spirit, and manner in which the reading of the scriptures should be approached. Throughout the author has in view the devotional, rather than the critical treatment of the Bible. He has regard to its use as the oracles of God from which the Divine will is to be ascertained, rather than to its character as a book which, because of its language, structure, and history, demands the arduous labours of the divinity student. In the course of pointing out the half-hearted way in which the Bible is often handled by those who admit its supreme authority as the treasury of inspired truth, he falls into the following impassioned strain:

'For there is no express stirring up of faculties to meditate her high and heavenly strains—nor formal sequestration of the mind from all other concerns on purpose for her special entertainment—nor pause of solemn seeking and solemn waiting for a spiritual frame, before entering and listening to the voice of the Almighty's wisdom. Who feels the sublime dignity there is in a saying fresh descended from the porch of heaven? Who feels the awful weight there is in the least iota that hath dropped from the lips of God? Who feels the thrilling fear or trembling hope there is in words whereon the eternal destinies of himself do hang? Who feels the tide of gratitude swelling within his breast, for redemption and salvation, instead of flat despair and everlasting retribution? Or who, in perusing the Word of God, is captivated through all his faculties, transported through all his emotions, and through all his energies of action wound up? To say the best, it is done as other duties are wont to be done: and having reached the rank of a daily, formal duty, the perusal of the Word hath reached its noblest place. That is the guide and spur of all duty, the necessary aliment of Christian life; the first and the last of Christian knowledge and Christian feeling hath, to speak the best, degene-

rated in these days to stand rank and file among those duties whereof it is parent, preserver, and commander. And to speak not the best, but the fair and common truth, this book, the offspring of the divine mind, and the perfection of heavenly wisdom, is permitted to lie from day to day, perhaps from week to week, unheeded and unperused; never welcome to our happy, healthy, and energetic moods; admitted, if admitted at all, in seasons of sickness, feeble-mindedness, and disabling sorrow. That which was sent to be a spirit of ceaseless joy and hope, within the heart of man, is treated as the enemy of happiness and the murderer of enjoyment, and eyed askance, as the remembrancer of death, and the very messenger of hell!

'Oh! if books had but tongues to speak their wrongs, then might this book well exclaim—Hear, O heavens! and give ear, O earth! I came from the love and embrace of God, and mute nature, to whom I brought no boon, did me rightful homage. To man I came, and my words were to the children of men. I disclosed to you the mysteries of hereafter, and the secrets of the throne of God. I set open to you the gates of salvation, and the way of eternal life, heretofore unknown. Nothing in heaven did I withhold from your hope and ambition; and upon your earthly lot I poured the full horn of divine providence and consolation. But ye requited me with no welcome, ye held no festivity on my arrival: ye sequester me from happiness and heroism, closeting me with sickness and infirmity: ye make not of me, nor use me for your guide to wisdom and prudence, but press me into your lists of duties, and withdraw me to a mere corner of time; and most of ye set at nought, and utterly disregard me. I came, the fulness of the knowledge of God: angels delighted in my company, and desired to dive into my secrets. But ye, mortals, place masters over me, subjecting me to the discipline and dogmatism of men, and tutoring me in your schools of learning. I came not to be silent in your dwellings, but to speak welfare to you and to your children. I came to rule, and my throne to set up in the hearts of men. Mine ancient residence was the bosom of God; no residence will I have but the soul of an immortal; and if you had entertained me, I should have possessed you of the peace which I had with God, "when I was with Him and was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him."—Vol. i. pp. 2—4.

In the second oration, 'On the Manner of consulting the Oracles of God,' there occurs a very characteristic specimen of the bold and uncompromising way in which Irving used to denounce the affected religionism of society. The fierce onslaughts he made from time to time upon the practices of those who prided themselves upon being 'evangelical' more than others, and claimed to be considered 'the religious world,' drew upon him much suspicion, and filled with a secret dislike of his views those of his brethren in the ministry, who had already as much as their Christian charity could endure in beholding the triumphant sway of his talents. The Pietists, both lay and clerical, the admirers and the admired of religious coteries, would hardly relish the pungent truthfulness of these remarks:—

'From this extreme of narrow and enforced attendance upon the Word of God, there are many who run into the other extreme of constant consultation, and cannot pass an evening together in conversation or enjoyment of any kind, but they call for the Bible and the exposition of its

truths by an able hand. That it becomes a family night and morning to peruse the Word—and that it becomes men to assemble themselves together to hear it expounded—is a truth; while at the same time it is no less a truth, that it is monkish custom, and a most ignorant slavery, to undervalue all intellectual, moral, or refreshing converse, for the purpose of hearing some favourite of the priesthood set forth his knowledge or his experience, though it be upon a holy subject. It is not that *he* may talk, but that *we all* may talk as becometh saints; it is not that we may hear the naked truth, but that we may exhibit our sentiments and views of all subjects, our tempers in all encounters, to be consistent with the truth. It is not merely to try our patience in hearing, but to exercise all our graces, that we come together. Let the Word be appealed to, in order to justify our opinions and resolve our doubts. Let there be an occasion worthy of it: then let it be called in. But it is to muzzle free discourse, and banish useful topics, and interrupt the mind's refreshment, and bring in upon our manly and freeborn way of life, the slavishness of a devotee, the coldness of a hermitage, and the formality of cloistered canons, thus to abolish the healthful pulses of unconstrained companionship, and the free disclosures of friendship, and the closer communion and fellowship of saints. Yet though thus we protest against the formality and deadness of such a custom, we are not prepared to condemn it, if it proceed from a pure thirst after divine teaching. If in private we have a still stronger relish for it than in company of our friends—if in silent study we love its lessons no less than from the lips of our favourite pastor—then let the custom have free course, and let the Word be studied whenever we have opportunity, and whenever we can go to it with a common consent.—Vol. i. pp. 21, 22.

We cannot pass by the third Oration without quoting a passage from it, which exhibits the tone of Irving's mind upon a subject of considerable interest in itself, and concerning which another distinguished, but utterly dissimilar, thinker has expressed himself in equally positive, but perfectly opposite terms. Religion was invested by Irving with the ideas of devotion, fervour, mystery, grandeur, spirituality. The office which the intellect had to fulfil in the practice of religion, was a part—and only a part—of the manifold complex whole as it appeared to his large mind. Notwithstanding hereditary bias, and the bent given by his education towards the hard abstractions of the Calvinian theory, Edward Irving had a deeply-seated principle of reverence which enabled him to battle manfully against these prepossessions. In his view, spiritual discernment was a nobler faculty than intellectual perception, and devotional fervour took rank before theological acumen. He esteemed a respectful obedience to authority, as of equal, if not of superior, value to a cold acquiescence in the results of criticism. Consequently, he recognized a religious faculty in a child, and considered it to be worthy of cultivation, even though it lacked the intellectual power of maturer years. He states his views with his usual force, thus:—

‘The raw opinion, that a certain maturity of judgment must be tarried for before entering into religious conference with our children, comes of



a notion which pervades the religious world, that religion rests upon the right apprehension of certain questions in theology, to which mature years are necessary; whereas it rests upon the authority of God, which a child can comprehend so soon as it can the authority of its father; upon the love of Christ which a child can comprehend so soon as it can the love of its mother; upon the assistance of the Spirit, which it can comprehend so soon as it is alive to the need of instruction or help from its parents; upon the difference between right and wrong, which it may be taught so soon as it can perform the one and avoid the other. There is a religion of childhood and a religion of manhood; the former standing mostly in authority, the latter in authority and reason conjoined; the former referring chiefly to words and actions, the latter embracing also principles and sentiments. But because you cannot instil into children the full maturity of religious truth, is no more an argument for neglecting to travel with them on religion, than it would be an argument to refuse teaching them obedience to yourself and respect of others till they could comprehend the principles on which parental obedience and friendly respect are grounded.—Vol. I. p. 38.

The opinion here laid down does not, indeed, necessarily clash with that which Archbishop Whately reiterated in his writings concerning the superstition which lurks in children's prayers: at the same time we strongly suspect, knowing how unlike the two men were in their views and tendencies, that Whately would have condemned as a superstition what Irving would have commended as a pious practice. The Archbishop says, 'The practice of teaching or allowing very young children to learn by heart prayers, psalms, portions of Scripture, &c. which they are incapable at the time of understanding, is one which is very often superstitious, and almost always leads to superstition.' But what meaning is to be attached to the word 'understanding' here? Does the writer intend by it that intelligent co-operation of the will with the act, by which the child, knowing what is the purpose and object of its prayers, and comprehending the duty of worship, is therefore able to accompany the utterance of the words of a prayer with the idea of addressing Almighty God as the Father of mercies? Or does he mean the clear perception of each proposition; which perception involves an accurate knowledge of the signification of each word, together with a clear understanding of the relation in which the various propositions stand to each other? These questions the Archbishop answers,—the former in the negative, the latter in the affirmative—in the two paragraphs which we will take leave to quote from his 'Essays on the Errors of Romanism,' Essay i. § 6:—

'Some, however, find that their children *do not* regard such repetitions as a painful, or even an uninteresting task, but consider themselves, though they do not understand what they utter, as performing an act of devotion. Now this is precisely the case I have more particularly in view at present. The other just mentioned, of learning the words merely as an exercise of memory, is likely to lead to superstition; but *this* is in itself

superstitious. For what do the Romanists more, than make devotion consist in repeating a hallowed form of words, with a general intention indeed of praying, but without accompanying with the understanding the words uttered ?

Before we copy the next paragraph, we must pause to point out a slip of this clear-headed and coldly logical prelate, which it is not a little remarkable that he should have made, considering the alertness he always displays in detecting such mistakes in others. 'This is in itself superstitious. For what do the Romanists, &c.' Let us throw this into a syllogistic form. It may be done in two ways. First. To utter words in prayer without understanding them is superstitious: the Romanists do this: *Ergo*, the Romanists are superstitious. Again, What Romanists do is superstitious: Romanists utter words in prayer without understanding their meaning: *Ergo*, to utter words in prayer without understanding their meaning is superstitious. If Dr. Whately had been a blind, unreasoning Protestant of the Exeter Hall type, whose whole creed is bound up in a single proposition, with its converse, namely—'All Romish practices are superstitious: all superstitious practices are Romish;' then we could have understood his writing after this fashion. But the fact is, the very aim and purpose of the book in which this fine reasoning occurs, is to combat and refute such narrow bigotry, and to point out that superstition is not the growth of any one form of religion more than another, but of human nature which underlies all forms; so that Protestants are just as liable to this corruption as Romanists, and, in fact, are addicted to superstitious practices the same in principle as theirs, only differing in their external form. Let us proceed to the next passage—

'But it may be replied, a child does understand *something* of what he is saying, if he does but understand that it is a prayer for some divine blessing; (an argument which may be, and is, urged by the Romanists in behalf of their Latin prayers;) while, on the other hand, the wisest man cannot be said *completely* to understand his prayers, since the nature of the Being he addresses must be mysterious to him.'

And then he goes on to remark how difficult it is, oftentimes, 'to draw a precise line in theory, which, in practice, common sense leads every one to distinguish sufficiently;' and he refers to Horace's well-known bit of sophistry:—

'Scriptor abhinc annos centum qui decidit inter  
Perfectos veteresque referri debet, an inter  
Viles atque novos? Excludat jurgia finis.  
Est vetus atque probus centum qui perficit annos.  
Quid, qui deperit minor uno mense vel anno,  
Inter quos referendus erit? veteresne poetas,  
An quos et præsens et postera respuat ætas?  
Iste quidem veteres inter ponetur honeste  
Qui vel mense brevi vel toto est junior anno.'

Utor permisso caudæque pilos ut equina  
 Paulatim vello et demo unum, demo et item unum,  
 Dum cadat elusus ratione ruentis acervi  
 Qui redit in fastos et virtutem æstimat annis,  
 Miraturque nihil nisi quod Libitina sacravit.

(Epis. II. i. 36—49.)

Now the fallacy of *sorites* can certainly be made of avail by those who desire to throw out the argument which aims at fixing upon a point of intelligence at which prayer ceases to be superstitious, and becomes devout; and Archbishop Whately forestalls it. But the mistake into which his hard intellectualism has led him, is the stigmatising as superstition or of superstitious tendency, whatsoever in religion is not a matter of intellectual apprehension. The arguments by which he endeavours to explicate the subject do, in fact, land him in this conclusion: that, although a man may be highly intellectual without being very devout, yet he cannot be very devout without being highly intellectual; in other words, piety depends upon mental ability. Perhaps he would not have accepted this deduction from his reasoning, but it is certainly the ultimate tendency of his reasoning both in this particular place and almost everywhere else in his writings. On the other hand, Irving very distinctly set forth that religion had broader foundations than intellectual power to rest upon; that the spiritual discernment was a faculty as active in the soul as intellectual perception in the mind; and that childhood had its power of being religious as well as manhood. Superstition is a great evil, and it would be very sad if the only sure antidote against it were a clear intellectual perception; for then but a small per-centage of mankind could possibly be safe from the disease, while the antidote itself would bring some minds into a state equally to be dreaded—the state of irreligion. For there is a positive danger lest the power of mere intellect should cast out, not only superstition, but religion likewise. Happily, however, intellectual perception is not the only, or even the best and safest antidote; and Irving had the advantage over Whately of being able to see, and to make others see, this. Through all his writings, in spite of some extravagance of thought, and the confusion which unavoidably resulted from his violent efforts to hold to the traditions of the Kirk, while he soared away into the region of a freer and fuller theology, Irving clearly recognises the distinction between nature and grace. Archbishop Whately, on the other hand, impresses one with the idea that besides nature he knew of nothing more powerful than the logical faculty.

Before leaving the comparison we have set up between these two divines, we will just quote a parallel bearing upon this same

subject—the religious education of children : ‘Can you believe,’ asks Irving, ‘that certain words lying dormant in the memory ‘during the years of budding manhood, will operate like an ‘Eastern talisman, or a Catholic scapular, against the encounter ‘of evil?’—Whately writes : ‘The intrinsic sanctity of the ‘words of the Lord’s Prayer, for instance, is the same only as ‘that of the wood of the true cross. . . . The child who repeats ‘the words by rote is no more benefited by them, than by carrying about him a piece of wood of the cross.’ There were, then, ideas of superstition over which Irving and Whately could shake hands.

In the beginning of the fourth oration (which continues the subject of the third) there stands a passage which strikes one as being not irrelevant to the times in which we live.

‘The eternal power and Godhead of our Creator, says S. Paul, speak through the things which are made. But the oracle of the works of God, however loud in commendation of His power and providence, is not easy to be explored by the multitude, who, little enlightened by knowledge, are much taken up with the necessary avocations of life. And those who are conversant with it, do generally, in the act of consulting, stop short in admiration of the temple itself, paying their reverence to its richness and decorations, but seldom reaching the inward sanctuary where the oracle is heard. Either nature hath changed her song, or man hath lost his faculty of interpreting it; for into his ear she now uttereth many a strain in commendation of herself, few in commendation of her God. And natural knowledge, while it is thus divorced from the knowledge of nature’s God, satisfieth not the spirit of man, which must join league with another spirit in order to taste its true delights. For what communion hath the soul with the superficial beauty of the earth, which they call taste, or with the knowledge of matter’s changes, which they call science? The human soul groans in languor till she finds a fellow spirit, or a generous cause of human welfare, to engage her affections; then beginneth her revelry of delight. Unfeigned friendship, chaste love, domestic affection, pure heavenward devotion,—who compares the intensity and delight of these unions with the stale and heartless sympathy there is between a naturalist and his museum, or a scholar and his books?’—Vol. i. p. 50.

And towards the close of the same oration occurs another passage equally pertinent on another subject.

‘This supremacy and empire of religion, zeal alone will not effect; the character of the age calls for argument and deep feeling and eloquence. You may keep a few devotees together by the hereditary reverence of ecclesiastical canons, and influence of ecclesiastical persons; but the thinking and influential minds must be overcome by showing, that not only can we meet the adversary in the field by force of argument, but that the spirit of our system is ennobling and consoling to human nature,—necessary to the right enjoyment of life and conducive to every good and honourable work. Religion is not now to be propagated by rebuking the free scope of thought, and drafting, as it were, every weak creature that will abase his power of mind before the zeal and unction of a preacher, and by schooling a host of weaklings to keep close and apart from the rest of the world. This both begins wrong and ends wrong. It begins wrong, by converting

only a part of the mind to the Lord, and holding the rest in superstitious bonds. It ends wrong, in not sending your man to combat in his courses with the unconverted. The reason of both errors being one and the same. Not having thoroughly furnished him to render a reason of the hope that is in him, you dare not trust him in the enemies' camp, lest they should bring him over again, or laugh at him for cleaving to a side which he cannot thoroughly defend.'—Vol. I. p. 63.

Before leaving the Orations, we may take the opportunity offered by a passage in the first oration, of remarking the stern face Irving set towards poetry in general. The severe character of the cold and unimpassioned form of Christianity in which he had been educated, overcame in this particular his natural inclination towards the poetic and imaginative; and he seemed to have frowned suspiciously upon all the employments of the Muse that were not of a distinctively religious kind. The words in which he censures the secular applications of verse are so impassioned, eloquent, and poetical themselves that our readers will agree with us in accepting them as at least a partial compensation for the somewhat narrow-minded sentiments they convey.

'Of the poets who charm the world's ear, which is he that inditeth a song unto his God? Some will tune their harp to sensual pleasures, and by the enchantment of their genius well-nigh commend their unholy themes to the imagination of saints. Others, to the high and noble sentiments of the heart, will sing of domestic joys and happy unions, casting around sorrow the radiancy of virtue, and bodying forth, in undying forms, the short-lived visions of joy! Others have enrolled themselves the high-priests of mute nature's charms, enchanting her echoes with their minstrelsy, and peopling her solitudes with the bright creatures of their fancy. But when, since the blind master of English song, hath any poured forth a lay equal to the Christian theme?'—Vol. i. p. 12.

With this may be compared another passage of like import which occurs in his last lecture on the Parable of the Sower.

'There is no worse sign of the times we live in, no clearer proof of the debasement of the soul of man, and demonstration of the ignorance of the world to come, than the many poems which are written, and the many songs which are sung, and the many journeys which are performed, in honour of certain lovely scenes and beautiful objects of nature. They will call me a Goth for saying so: but it is a Christian, and a Christian minister, who speaketh so; and one who heretofore drank at this fountain as copious draughts as any of the nature-worshippers. But how can anyone who is at all interested in the primæval state of paradise which he hath lost, or at all believeth in the millennial and the eternal glory of the world of which he is an heir, take delight and shout forth joyfully in contemplating the present misery of the lower world: when he beholdeth the sandy wastes, the rugged mountains, the hoary forests, the inhospitable climates of heat and cold, the changeful accidents of thunderstorm and thunderbolts, the avalanches of snow and inundations of wasteful waters, the iron frosts, the drenching rains; in one word the natural barrenness of the earth's bosom, and the evil conditions which she underlieth since

the Fall? I speak not now of the partial deliverance which the well-bestowed sweat of man may give her from the rugged wilderness of her nature; but I speak of her proper nature, and show you how ill-attuned to truth are those rapturous strains which they utter over the elemental world.—Vol i. p. 322.

We pass on now to the second and larger portion of Irving's first published work, the 'Argument for Judgment to Come.' The reader has already been informed of Mr. Carlyle's unaccountable omission of this piece from his collection of Irving's writings. The edition we shall refer to is the second, published in 1823. The Argument is introduced by an epistle dedicatory addressed 'To the Rev. Robert Gordon, Minister of the Gospel, Edinburgh;' in which the design of the work is declared to be, 'to recover the great subject of Judgment to Come, from poetical visionaries on the one hand, and from religious rhapsodists on the other; and to place it upon the foundation of Divine revelation, of human understanding, and the common good.' The exordium concludes with this brief sketch of the Argument: 'First, we shall set forth the constitution of Divine government upon which this judgment is to be passed. Then we shall treat of the actual judgment; and, lastly, do our endeavour to guide the people into the way of salvation from the judgment, concerning which, if they should continue reckless, we shall strike a note to thrill the drowsy chambers of the soul, and awaken it from its fatal slumbers.' (p. 107.)

The main argument of the first part turns upon the question of responsibility. In working it out illustrations are drawn from the political, social, and domestic organizations of the world, with all the diversity of treatment and luxuriance of expression for which Irving's writings are even so remarkable. He amply fulfils the intention which he himself announces at the outset. 'We shall indulge in disquisition, to clear the subject of obscurity; and in digression, to render it entertaining; and in application to touch, in passing, any interest or emotion which may be affected.' As a specimen of digression we may extract the following beautiful passage:—

'Now, in turning over the sacred books to examine into this previous question, we find them full of various information concerning the interest which God hath taken in man from the very first, and the schemes which He hath on foot to ameliorate our state, the desire He hath to contribute to our present happiness, and the views He hath for our future glory. He presents Himself as our father, who first breathed into our nostrils the breath of life, and ever since hath nourished and brought us up as children: who prepared the earth for our habitation; and for our sakes made its womb to teem with food, with beauty, and with life. For our sakes no less He garnished the heavens and created the whole host of them with the breath of His mouth, bringing the sun forth from his chamber every morning, with the joy of a bridegroom and a giant's strength,



to shed his cheerful light over the face of creation, and draw blooming life from the cold bosom of the ground. From Him also was derived the wonderful workmanship of our frames—the eye, in whose small orb of beauty is pencilled the whole of heaven and of earth, for the mind to peruse and know and possess and rejoice over, even as if the whole universe were her own—the ear, in whose vocal chambers are entertained harmonious numbers, the melody of rejoicing nature, the welcomes and salutations of friends, the whisperings of love, the voices of parents and of children, with all the sweetness that resideth in the tongue of man. His also is the gift of the beating heart, flooding all the hidden recesses of the human frame with the tide of life—His the cunning of the hand, whose workmanship turns rude and raw materials to pleasant forms and wholesome uses—His the whole vital frame of man, is a world of wonders within itself, a world of bounty, and, if rightly used, a world of finest enjoyments. His also the mysteries of the soul within—the judgment, which weighs in a balance all contending thoughts, extracting wisdom out of folly, and extricating order out of confusion; the memory, recorder of the soul, in whose books are chronicled the accidents of the changing world, and the fluctuating moods of the mind itself; fancy, the eye of the soul, which scales the heavens and circles round the verge and circuits of all possible existence; hope, the purveyor of happiness, which peoples the hidden future with brighter forms and happier accidents than ever possessed the present, offering to the soul the foretaste of every joy; affection, the nurse of joy, whose full bosom can cherish a thousand objects without being impoverished, but rather replenished, a storehouse inexhaustible towards the brotherhood and sisterhood of this earth, as the storehouse of God is inexhaustible to the universal world; finally, conscience, the arbitrator of the soul, and the touchstone of the evil and the good, whose voice within our breast is the echo of the voice of God. These, all these, whose varied action and movement constitutes the maze of thought, the mystery of life, the continuous chain of being—God hath given us to know that we hold of His hand, and during His pleasure, and out of the fullness of His care.—*Judgment to Come*, p. 119.

When he meets the objections that may be raised to a divinely instituted system of rewards and punishments, he makes this reference to Locke:—‘It has been well shown by ‘the greatest philosopher, and perhaps the most truth-loving ‘man, that England hath produced, that a law is nothing ‘unless it be supported by rewards and punishments.’ The foot-note only refers generally to the ‘*Essay on Human Understanding*;

‘but doubtless the particular passage in view is Book II. chap. xxviii. § 6, *Moral Rules*. The exceeding dry style of Locke contrasts so strikingly with the exuberant style of Irving that we are tempted to exhibit the quotation:—

‘Of these moral rules, or laws, to which men generally refer, and by which they judge of the rectitude or pravity of their actions, there seems to me to be three sorts, with their three different enforcements, or rewards and punishments. For since it would be utterly in vain to suppose a rule set to the free actions of man, without annexing to it some enforcement of good and evil, to determine his will, we must, wherever we suppose a law, suppose also some reward or punishment annexed to that law. It would be in vain for one intelligent being to set a rule to the actions of another,

if he had it not in his power to reward the compliance with, and punish deviation from, his rule, by some good and evil that is not the natural product and consequence of the action itself ; for that being a natural convenience, or inconvenience, would operate of itself, without a law. This, if I mistake not, is the true nature of all law, properly so called.'

The second and third parts treat of 'the constitution under which it hath pleased God to place the world.' In the course of the treatment the contrast between the externalism of law and the internalism of the Gospel is largely discussed ; and along with Irving's redundant eloquence upon this subject, may be read the fifth and eighth of Archbishop Whately's Essays, 'On some of the difficulties in the writings of S. Paul.' The second part of 'Ecce Homo' (on Christ's legislation) occurs to one's memory as the most recent and remarkable effort to deal with this question. Perhaps it would not be possible to find three writers, more dissimilar in their manner and tone, following out converging lines of thought upon the same topic. If we may be allowed to throw out a piece of criticism in passing, and distinguish between their styles of composition, we should say that the style of Irving was like the dashing, roaring waters of some majestic river, plunging over precipices and brawling amongst rocks ; that the style of Whately was like the straight canal, noiselessly flowing onwards to its end between two precise banks ; and that the style of 'Ecce Homo' was like the pleasant, picturesque stream that glided here and darted there, always without turmoil, yet never without spirit.

In the course of his remarks Irving has occasion to refer to Jeremy Bentham, and he does so in these words :—'Human laws, judged of and executed by man, have in them properly 'no moral sanction whatever, as has been well shown by the 'shrewdest jurisconsult, yet perhaps most limited philosopher 'of the day.' The Utilitarian, doubtless, would seem to Irving very limited in his ideas ; but Irving had a manly, generous way of declaring his dissent from others on whatever points of difference there may have existed between him and them, and at the same time he would quote unreservedly such opinions of theirs as coincided with his own.

After having sketched the Christian code and pointed out its contrasts, in principles and practice, with all codes of law properly so called, he proceeds to elaborate the thought of human nature striving after an ideal perfection. We extract one of the paragraphs in which he carries on the discussion, and present it to the reader as a gem worthy to rank with the finest pieces of English prose composition. The depth and the compass of thought are no less admirable than the beauty of the construction and the chasteness of the language.

Next, as to their sublime and inaccessible reach of virtue. I hold this to be one of the chief points in which the adaptation of the divine laws to human nature is revealed. Yes, paradoxical as it may seem, their application to human nature is in nothing more revealed than in their celestial and ideal perfection : for it is the nature of man, especially of youth, which determineth the cast of future manhood, to place before him the highest patterns in that kind of excellence at which he aimeth. Human nature thirsteth for the highest and the best, not the most easily attained. The faculty of hope is ever conjuring into being some bright estate, far surpassing present possession—the faculty of fancy ever wingeth aloft into regions of ethereal beauty and romantic fiction, far beyond the boundaries of truth. There is a refined nature in man, which the world satisfieth not: it calls for poetry to mix up happier combinations for its use—it magnifies, it beautifies, it sublimes every form of creation, and every condition of existence. Oh, heavens! how the soul of man is restless and unbound! how it lusteth after greatness! how it revolveth around the sphere of perfection, but cannot enter in! how it compasseth round the seraph-guarded verge of Eden, but cannot enter in! That wo-begone and self-tormented, wretched man, our poet, hath so feigned it of Cain; but it is not a wicked murderer's part thus upwards to soar, and sigh that he can go no higher: it is the part of every noble faculty of the soul, which God hath endowed with purity and strength above its peers. For the world is but an average product of the minds that make it up; its laws are for all those that dwell therein, not for the gifted few; its customs are covenants for the use of the many; and when it pleaseth God to create a master spirit in any kind—a Bacon in philosophy, a Shakspeare in fancy, a Milton in poetry, a Newton in science, a Locke in sincerity and truth—they must either address their wondrous faculties to elevate that average which they find established, and so bless the generations that are to come; or, like that much-to-be-pitied master of present poetry, and many other mighty spirits of this licentious day, they must rage and fret against the world; which world will dash them off, as the prominent rocks do the feeble barque which braves them; leaving them to after ages monuments of reckless folly. That same world will dash them off, which, if they had come with honest, kind intentions, would have taken them into its bosom even as other rocks of the ocean do throw their everlasting arms abroad, and take within their peaceful bays thousands of the tallest ships which sail upon the bosom of the deep. It is, I say, the nature of every faculty of the mind created greater than ordinary, to dress out a feast for that same faculty in other men, to lift up the limits of enjoyment in that direction, and plant them a little onward into the regions of unreclaimed thought. And so it came to pass that God, who possesseth every faculty in perfection, when He put His hand to the work, brought forth this perfect institution of moral conduct, in order to perfect as far as could be, the moral condition and consequent enjoyment of man.—Pp. 142-4.

Here we see, notwithstanding the hard things Irving has elsewhere said against poetry, that he would not quite have gone with Plato in excluding poets from his ideal republic.

In the fourth part, concerning the good effects of the constitution of responsibility, under which God has placed mankind, upon the individual and upon political society, Irving indulges very freely in the liberty of illustration, now exposing the fallacies of those 'who do but babble about liberty and reformation, who think that the depressed condition of a people can

'be elevated to its proper place by political means alone;' now inveighing against the debasements of sense and the corruptions of habit, into which the English have fallen from the simplicity and virtue of former times; now extolling the Reformation, and holding up its results (as they appeared to him in his day) to the grateful admiration of mankind, and pointing out how it restored 'England, Scotland, Holland, half of Germany, and the Scandinavian nations, to free use of the faculty of thought' (and if Irving were living now, he probably would add, with much eloquent lamentation, that the 'free use' had degenerated into an abuse of that faculty, to the subversion of all faith, reverence, and devotion); now expatiating upon the successful labours of Gospel missionaries. The wide range of his reading, and the ease with which he commands his information to do him service in the elaboration of his argument, are very conspicuous throughout this section.

But we cannot, within the space which necessarily limits our range, continue to treat with the same fulness even the remainder of this book on Judgment to Come, far less the portly volumes that are still untouched, and yet must receive some notice at our hands. In fact, Edward Irving is one of the most difficult writers we are acquainted with to tear oneself away from. Men who write very connectedly and clearly are, for the most part, limited in their range, and also precise and definite in the sections in which they dispose their argument, so that one can, without difficulty, detach a portion and deal with it by itself. Those writers, on the other hand, who are wide-spread in the scope of their ideas, are generally incoherent and confined in their style, and so have only to be picked up in the fragmentary forms in which they lie about, which is easy work for the critic. But Irving united connectedness without its limitations to diffuseness without its incoherences.

Throughout the remaining five portions of the 'Argument for Judgment to Come,' the author advances with the same majestic stride; nor does either the richness of his language deteriorate, or the vigour of his thought grow feeble. Again and again we stand at gaze before a passage of surpassing eloquence. Perhaps the most masterly and best-sustained portion of the work is the very remarkable disquisition upon S. Matthew xxv. 31—46; the 'six charities upon which the distinctions of the 'righteous and the wicked are made to turn;' 'the six necessary 'consolations and supports of human life—bread, water, and 'clothing—health, human fellowship, and the freedom to travel 'over the creation of God' (p. 326). Before we close the volume we shall claim the thanks of our readers for placing before them the following extracts, in which Irving, after a manner peculiar

to himself, reflects upon the cold and unappreciative reception which the world at first gave to the poems of Wordsworth. The independent tone which that poet held towards public opinion repeatedly finds a counter-note in the writings of our divine; and what Wordsworth wrote to Southey might have come from Irving at any time during his career:—‘ Let the age ‘continue to love its own darkness; I shall continue to write ‘with, I trust, the light of Heaven upon me.’

‘There is one man in these realms, who hath addressed himself to such a Godlike life, and dwelt alone amidst the grand and lovely scenes of nature, and the deep unfathomable secrecies of human thought. Would to Heaven it were allowed to others to do likewise! And he hath been rewarded with many new cogitations of nature and of nature’s God; and he hath heard in the stillness of his retreat, many new voices of his conscious spirit—all which he hath sung in harmonious numbers. But, mark the epicurean soul of this degraded age! They have frowned on him; they have spit on him; they have grossly abused him. The masters of this critical generation (like generation, like masters!) have raised the hue and cry against him; the literary and sentimental world, which is their sounding-board, hath reverberated it; and every reptile who can retail an opinion in print, hath spread it, and given his reputation a shock, from which it is slowly but surely recovering. All for what! For making nature and his own bosom his home, and daring to sing of the simple but sublime truths which were revealed to him: for daring to be free in his manner of uttering genuine feeling and depicting natural beauty, and grafting thereon devout and solemn contemplations of God. Had he sent his Cottage Wanderer forth upon an “Excursion” amongst courts and palaces, battle-fields, and scenes of faithless gallantry, his musings would have been more welcome, being far deeper and tenderer than those of “the heartless Childe;” but because the man hath valued virtue, and retiring modesty, and common household truth, over these the ephemeral decorations or excessive depravities of our condition, therefore he is hated and abused!’—*Ibid.* p. 504.

We now return to Irving’s writings as they are presented to us by Mr. Carlyle; and if we seem to have bestowed a disproportionate amount of space and attention upon the ‘Argument for Judgment to Come,’ we must hold Mr. Carlyle responsible, who has thrown upon us the task of making our readers acquainted with one of the most remarkable of his uncle’s works.

In dealing with the ponderous volumes before us it is both unnecessary and undesirable to do more than dip into them here and there for samples of the author’s manner of treating certain great subjects. With the exception of the ‘Historical View of the Church of Scotland before the Reformation,’ and the ‘Notes on the Standards of the Church of Scotland’ (vol. i. pp. 543-645), the writings of Irving were either sermons, or at any rate the substance of sermons put forth in a slightly different dress. Consequently there is an inevitable redundancy of thought, and even

of expression, pervading the whole. In fact, notwithstanding the copiousness of his language, and the wealth of illustration with which he enriched every subject he handled, Irving had one tendency, which was strong even to a fault; namely, that of launching forth into grandiloquent generalities, which were equally apposite, or equally irrelevant, to any one of the disquisitions he undertook.

A large section of the first volume is taken up with six lengthy lectures upon 'The Parable of the Sower.' In these discourses, filling upwards of three hundred closely-printed pages, Irving has certainly exhausted the homiletic resources of the parable. Indications of his bias, which made him lean away from the received views of the orthodox Presbyterians of his day, crop out thickly. We will place a few specimens before the reader. Upon the doctrine of baptism Irving again and again expressed himself in terms consistent only with a belief in it as the sacrament of regeneration. He, moreover, fenced off the various forms of error which grow out of unsound views upon this sacrament; and he remarks wisely that, 'among the many errors which adult baptism tendeth to, it is none of the least that it should favour this notion, that men are not competent to faith from their earliest youth, but must wait for maturity of years.' Other passages might be quoted which, though easily discernible in their tone from the teaching of the Church Catholic, yet are vastly superior to much of what one hears and reads on the part of those with whom Irving, at that time at least, was supposed to symbolize. If they do not touch, they certainly have a decided inclination towards, the full truth. Referring to his interpretation of the 'Seed on the Rock' (Lect. ii.) he says: 'However much, at first sight, it may seem to war with the popular theology, at present reputed Evangelical, it will be found, upon examination, greatly to support the true orthodox doctrine of the Church; which, while it yields regeneration only to the supernatural work of the Holy Ghost, doth yet view everything which befalleth us, whether immediately from Providence, or mediately through the Church, to be a part of God's dealing and argument with us, to the end of bringing us unto Christ. Whence the Church appointeth Infant Baptism, under proper sponsorship, in order to signify that every act done by another towards these little ones, should be done in the Spirit of Christ; while at the same time she teacheth, that all the acts of God's providence, towards those within the covenant, are acts as much under the dispensation of Christ as is the giving of His Spirit. But, in these times, when we have emptied the sacrament of baptism of all its holy burden, and constituted an ideal sacrament of



'conversion, it will be necessary to clear these things somewhat more distinctly' (i. p. 152).

The last sentence is noteworthy, and it ought to be added that Irving had already, on the previous page, stigmatized the 'appetite for extreme cases of conversion' as being 'but a bastard Popery.'

Further on we meet with this passage, which reflects principally that view of holy baptism which may be called the declaratory or ratificatory; the view, namely, of which Robertson of Brighton may be considered to be the most distinguished modern propounder. Having stated that there is the grace and mercy of a Divine purpose in every man's creation, he proceeds to lay down that 'to signify this is one of the ends of the baptism of infants; which declareth that from the womb they are subjects of this Divine grace. The Trinity—that is, God, as revealed by Christ Jesus—doth claim the birth and life of the little one as their [*sic*] own, and do [*sic*] write him down in the sight of all as the offspring of their handiwork, the creature of their providence and the object of their care. And this is not the less true of all, that it is only by sacrament declared by the Church upon her children, because the Church only is regarded by Christ as believing His declarations. But though only declared of the children of the Church, there can be no doubt it is true of all, and would be of all declared, if they would but confess a faith whereto the declaration might be made. For it is manifestly preposterous, and a profanation, to declare any of the fruits of Christ's redemption to those who believe not at all in Him' (i. p. 154). There is a mixture of strong meat and rather thin milk here, as regards doctrine; which remark is good of much that Irving writes upon such subjects. We suppose that we must read the words we are now about to quote by the light of the last-cited passage, although, in themselves, they would be patient of a sounder interpretation. 'The new man-child of the Second Adam, by the regeneration of the Holy Ghost, must be born in thee, and brought up in thee by the ministry of the bread of life and water of salvation; that child whose communion is with the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, of whom also he is the offspring, as is set forth in the mystery of baptism' (i. p. 189).

Here it may not be out of place to quote a passage from the Lectures upon John the Baptist, now first published ('delivered in the year 1823, soon after Mr. Irving settled in London,' as an editorial note informs us), for the sake of its appropriateness; and it must be accepted as the only notice we can take of that interesting series of discourses:—

'This [referring to S. Luke iii. 3—14] is [the first baptismal service upon record. And if anything were needed as a commentary upon the sacrament of baptism, we should refer to the stern and severe welcome to the fount, upon which we have already discoursed, and to those imperious commandments to all who came. But there needeth no commentary upon either of the Christian sacraments; whereof the one before us signifies by its very emblem an ablution and purification from former uncleanness—the other, a divine nourishment in a new life, and a sacred union to the body of Christ;—the two taken together presenting to our eye the two great principles of our dispensation—repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ.]—*Collected Writings*, Vol. ii. p. 40.

The fact is, throughout the whole of Irving's writings we observe that his mind ever and anon turned to the sacramental element of the Christian Church with the fidelity of the needle to the pole. No matter what may be the special subject upon which he is discoursing, we are sure to come upon passages thickly strewn over the field of his inquiry which breathe a very lofty and reverent spirit concerning the two Sacraments of the Gospel. Take this for a specimen:—'The doctrine that the two Sacraments are no more than bare and naked signs, we utterly abhor and detest; but that they are most apt and beautiful signs of that consummated life, whereof they are also the actual and sealed commencement and continuance in them who believe, and in those who believe not the seals of their apostasy, there can be no doubt' (v. p. 302). Here again is a passage which, for tone and doctrine, the most orthodox Churchman might be proud to call his own: 'According as Christ liveth in us, according as, by faith, we do incorporate the body of Christ with ourselves, according as we assimilate the Divine food of the Lord's Supper unto that life which we have in baptism, we do verily increase in the stature, in the wisdom, in the power of Christ; and we do increase in love, union, and fellowship with one another, through the Holy Ghost. That food which we receive from heaven, that immortal food which we have in the Supper of the Lord, though it be flesh and blood, is not flesh and blood subsisting through the power of the living soul; natural life cannot quicken; natural life cannot assimilate it. It is the flesh and blood of the spiritual life which the Holy Spirit did sustain in Christ, pure and spotless, and which the Holy Ghost in us doth assimilate for the nourishment of His life' (v. p. 445). And can the wide-spread error, which dissects the inward spiritual grace and the outward visible sign in holy baptism, receive a more trenchant blow than is dealt in the sentences we are about to quote? 'John's baptism was a baptism unto expectation; Christ's baptism is a baptism unto possession. And, methinks, in these times they believe themselves to be baptized only into the expectation of receiving,

'and not into the actual receiving, of the Holy Ghost; into John's baptism, and not into Christ's baptism, which will be followed with the forgetting that there is a Holy Ghost' (v. p. 130).

In Irving's mind there always dwelt the strongest possible antipathy to cant; although, alas! he himself was doomed to be the victim of one of its most outrageous forms. This abhorrence of cant manifests itself repeatedly in his writings, and it is quite interesting and instructive to select from them the spirited portraits he draws of the characters he sarcastically labels as 'Evangelicals,' 'Bible Christians,' 'Converts.' Here is the 'Bible Christian':—

'Each man will read the Bible for himself, having a hearty contempt for creeds and confessions and orthodoxy. And fine work they make of it! And they call themselves Bible Christians! Which men I have found so self-opinioned, so prejudiced against the most venerable forms of the Church, so mighty in their own conceit, and so fond of innovation, that I have got an instinct of abhorrence towards them, and would rather hope to have communion with a superstitious Papist, than with one of these self-instructed, self-guided Bible Christians, as they are wont to call themselves in their contempt for all who have any reverence for the authority of the Church. They are exactly to religion what your weaver statesman and shoemaker political economist are in civil affairs.'—Vol. i. pp. 120-1.

In another place he gives this sort of character such pungent counsel as the following:—'Come, my Bible-proud brother, let me tell thee a secret into thine own ear, as it were heard only by thyself: because thou settest no store by the constantly received opinion of Christ's Church, I dread thou art an ignorant novice, or a self-conceited bigot; and that, if thou take not heed, Satan will make thee an incorrigible heretic' (p. 134).'

The picture of the 'Convert' of the period is struck out in a few vigorous lines after this fashion: 'The converts of this infirm character generally come out of a worldly and gay class of men, who, by some powerful statement of the truth, come to be impressed; and as like generally produceth like, the impression is most commonly made by appeals to their fears or to their affections, or what is commonly in these times called preaching to the heart,—simple preaching—affectionate preaching, wherein there is no bone of doctrine,—no strong sinew of duty, but an outward alabaster-form of skin and flesh; some water-colour gaudy sketch of the person of Christ; some flattering encomium of the beauty of religion; some poetical representation of the pleasures of godliness; perhaps some rhapsody of the joys of heaven, or savage scheme of the horrors of hell; some form of that preaching which now is popular throughout the churches, catches the ear of certain

‘ novices, and a little moves the surface waters of their spirit. They are said to be impressed, and upon the instant hailed as brethren. They are taken under the wing of some society; they are advanced to be collectors of money for it; they receive the *entrée*, and are introduced at certain religious parties, and are said to be doing well, in a most hopeful way; and they hear incessantly of the pleasures of religion, and of the great doings of the religious world. And what comes of it in the end? They rejoice, and much rejoice, but suffer nothing; they seem to think that Christ hath suffered the whole, and that they have nothing to do but to enjoy.’ And so on; yet further, stripe upon stripe, does this great theological satirist chastise the pretenders, and expose the shams, and give to ridicule the divers kinds of cant.

We have adduced scattered passages from Irving’s writings bearing upon sacramentality in general, and in particular upon the sacrament of baptism. But one of the most important of his published works was a volume of ‘ Homilies on Baptism,’ with an epistle dedicatory to his wife, the touching words of which are already known to this generation from having been repeated by Mrs. Oliphant in her *Life of Irving*. It is not possible for us, within our limits, to give the reader a complete idea of this doctrinal treatise, but we will quote its concluding paragraph, in which that most important element in the practical working of baptism in the discipline of after-life—the element of responsibility—is exhibited :—

‘ This now is the conclusion of the whole matter concerning baptism, that every one, whether for himself alone, or for those also for whom he is responsible, should believe that God hath entered into covenant with him, in the most awful name of the ever-blessed Trinity, and that he is a person entered into the most solemn covenant with God; which covenant God will not abrogate, and man cannot. This covenant apprehendeth us as altogether sunk in sin, and destitute through every infirmity; and, apprehending us thus, doth, of free grace, endue us with forgiveness of sins, and the powers of the Holy Ghost: “ Repent and be baptized every one of you, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost.” From the celebration and solemnization of that holy covenant, we ought to abide under the continual state of men forgiven—not once forgiven, but forgiven for a continuance; seeing we sin for a continuance. To doubt of our forgiveness at any time, or for any sin (except the sin against the Holy Ghost, of which I speak not), is to doubt, not the word merely, nor the promise merely, but the covenant of God: which, as it is the most solemn of all God’s transactions, may not be doubted, or disbelieved, or despised without the most aggravated sin against God, who is very truth, without variableness or shadow of turning. This is the very end of the covenant, to transfer the general promise to an individual soul, and seal it upon him as his own. The faith, therefore, of a baptized person is, that he himself is forgiven, and anything short of this is to make void the covenant. Secondly, From the moment of his baptism and ever onward till the separation of soul and body, we ought to look upon our body as a

pure and cleansed substance, inhabited by the Holy Ghost, and by Him empowered to live the life of Christ, and keep the commandments of God blameless. Nothing should appear too difficult for us, because the Holy Spirit, that dwelleth in us, is irresistible. In the habitual exercise of these two continued states of the renewed soul, peace with God, through the imputed righteousness of Christ, and sanctification unto all obedience, through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, a baptized person ought to live: in thus living, he believeth the word and honoureth the act of the covenant of his God. And if, at any time, the clouds of doubt, and the fears of infirmity and falling away, are permitted by God to come over the soul of a baptized person, they are to be looked upon as temptations of Satan through the infirmity of our faith; and the only way which I know for effectually removing them is, to turn the eye of such a one unto God—as a covenant-keeping God, and to that covenant which He hath made with him in the sacrament of baptism.—Vol. ii. p. 431.

The ten Homilies on Baptism are succeeded by the eight Homilies on the Lord's Supper in this edition; but the latter, although intended by Irving for the press, were never published in his lifetime, and to the present editor we are indebted for their appearance in print. The last Homily is very valuable for the insight it gives into the increasing tendency of Irving's views towards Catholic doctrine concerning the Sacraments. It opens with a passage which makes it clear that Irving was not of that school of anti-sacramentalists who refuse to recognise any connexion between Baptism and S. John iii., or between the Eucharist and S. John vi. Towards its close occurs a paragraph which witnesses so strikingly to the boldness of the man who could dare to utter such language from a Presbyterian pulpit, that we need only leave it to tell its own tale.

‘The words which He had spoken [viz. S. John vi. 59—64] were of so corporeal, and, I may say, material a sense, that the wonder is not that some should have taken them literally, and do yet take them literally to mean an eating and drinking by the sense of a material flesh and blood, but the wonder is, upon the other hand, that all should not have taken up this interpretation of them. We wonder not that the error of transubstantiation, all absurd as it is, should have come into the Church, when we read this discourse, and consider the language of the Lord's Supper: “This is my Body, and this is my Blood.” But we do wonder that any man of common honesty, having such words in the communion, and such an interpretation of these words in this discourse, should dare to say that there is not any real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper, or any real eating and drinking of the same by the faith of every believer; that it is a mere memorial of His death. Oh, I cannot express my abhorrence and detestation of such an ignominious, shameful deprivation [depravation?] of this holy mystery, which the Lord hath so defended; and I say it again, I would rather, many times, be guilty with those who ignorantly believe transubstantiation, interpreting our Lord's words to the sense to which He never spake, instead of interpreting them to faith, to which He always spake, than with those who contradict both the letter and the spirit, and speak neither to sense nor to faith, but to the mere acknowledgment of a fact which no well-informed man ever dreamt of doubting, that the Lord Jesus Christ was crucified upon Mount

Calvary. If the Lord had meant merely that He was to die, and that His death was to be kept in remembrance, what were there so astounding in this to the ears of man, as that they would call it a hard word which no one could bear? And what were the meaning of wrapping it up in language which seemed constructed on very purpose to be offensive to the ear and common sense of man? If that, indeed, were His meaning merely, His words were ill-chosen words; and His disciples did well to be offended. But if, as hath been said, He would express an assimilating and visiting power of faith, such as there is no other language for expressing but the language of eating and drinking; and if the only object of that faith be His human substance, what other way was there to express the nature, the virtue, and the effects of that act of faith upon His human subsistence, but by eating His flesh and drinking His blood?—Vol. ii. p. 635.

We shall pass over the third and fourth volumes with but slight notice of their contents. The third volume consists of fourteen discourses on Prayer; four discourses on Praise; a series of nine lectures on Family and Social Religion; together with eight discourses delivered on public occasions. The whole range over the period 1823—1827, and was chiefly preached in Hatton Garden. The fourth volume contains thirty-eight miscellaneous discourses, 'written,' as the editor informs us, 'at various periods, between the year 1822, when Mr. Irving first settled in London, and 1832, two years before his death. The whole of them, with one exception, are now printed for the first time.' The first seven discuss the various forms of idolatry into which Protestants are liable to fall. Throughout these, and we may add throughout all Irving's writings, there runs that perfect fairness of spirit which enabled him to detect the weak points in his communion, and recognise much of the excellencies of communions from which he dissented. The unsparing severity with which he used to expose the besetting faults of his co-religionists, the frank and cordial manner in which he always spoke of the Church of England as a sister church, the courageous acknowledgment which he ever and anon made of essential truth underlying the erroneous dogmas and practices of the Roman branch, distinguish him as a man of great nobility of heart. Take this extract, from his lecture upon the 'Idolatry of Symbols and Forms,' to illustrate our meaning:—

'Yet though it be manifest that these public services of prayer and praise have no significance or spirit save in those who are sanctified unto the Lord by personal sanctification, this does not hinder the heartless formalists, who go through it Sabbath after Sabbath, bowing and kneeling, and responding in proper time, from thinking that thereby the whole form of religion is accomplished, and that Christ inquireth no more after them, but is well content with having received these large dues from their unwilling hand. These men are less to be spared than the Papists, who really claim pity for the thick blind and mystery of iniquity which hath been spread on the light of truth; but then our Protestant formalists have the truth shining in their face, through the pure and wholesome air,



yet wilfully will they hide themselves from His light, and involve themselves in artificial darkness, and worship the darkness which they have made. Theirs, above all others, is the condemnation that light hath come into the world, but that they loved darkness rather than light. And the Papist hath really something to show for himself: his bead-roll, his pater-nosters, his crossings, his masses, his confessions and absolutions, his household gods, which he calls saints, his gods of the place, and his gods of the days and months; but then our Protestant formalists, having nothing of that multitude of forms to show, have yet the face to think that an hour on Sabbath, the laziest, heaviest hour in the weekful of hours, will purchase absolution for all the rest, and is hardly remunerated by an eternity of blessedness. Such Protestant formalists are on the very edge of no religion. Theirs is a sorry sham of a religion, but the Catholics have a broad-spreading and cunning substitution for a religion. The former is the most inexcusable; the latter is the most lamentable. The former hath but a step to become an infidel. Amongst a nation of the former—which our nation, I think, is fast hastening to become—a new plantation of religion is required; amongst a nation of the latter, reformation is what is needed, some powerful hand to strip off the veil under which the beauty and loveliness and active members of religion have been buried. We have less danger in our Church from this quarter, having no forms of prayer; but in our sister Church the danger is imminent, even amongst the godly, of idolizing those forms in which their Church is most piously and decently arrayed. And if I err not, at this very time it hath grown into an idol with the most pious of her people, and is too much talked of and discoursed of, and depended on. But amongst the mass of the people of all ranks it is an idol as surely as the Catholic missal; and the weekly saying of its prayers is as securely rested upon as the intercession of all the saints in the canon. And so it will continue until, instead of gratifying the idol, and abetting the idolatry with continual offerings of adulation, they bear against both with a constant prophecy of condemnation, and shake the people out of their blind veneration of a most excellent book, in order that they may introduce them to its wholesome religious acts,—tear the veil of superstition which is at present over it, that the people may come at the true light and nourishment which it contains.—Vol. iv. p. 65.

A few pages further on he utters this remarkable sentence: 'Let religion sleep on contented with its quietness and serenity, and we shall find ourselves a nation of formalists, like the Protestants on the Continent, who have at this day purely less of the true religion than the Catholics have.' How true this has become, makes it sound in our ears like a prophecy. Continental Protestantism, as all know now, is a miserable failure. But forty years ago, when Irving preached thus, the general opinion was very strongly in favour of its being the only source of spiritual life, and the undoubted asylum of doctrinal purity. Irving, however, was extremely dissatisfied with it, and took no pains to conceal his dissatisfaction. In fact, we are again and again astonished at the hard things he had to say of Protestantism in general; and it is impossible to resist the conviction that from first to last he was, at heart, in rebellion against its spirit. If we go over the salient features

of Protestantism, we shall not be able to point out one that escapes his censure. It is true that he does not professedly level his strictures at the principles, but rather points them at what he desired to regard as departures from those principles; but we repeatedly find him cutting up the roots when he thinks he is only lopping off the useless branches. His sermon upon 'Idolatry of the Book—the Bible,' is a fair illustration of what we mean. Read this passage:—

'A third form in which the idolatry of the written word expresseth itself is in the holy—but I call it unholy—notion which they have taken up concerning inspiration: that the very words are inspired, and the writers were but as organs of voice for that word. Where, then, were the sanctification of the writers if their soul were not in their words? And you will hear shrewd suggestions that even the act of translation hath a certain divine sanctity in it. Thus the Jews proceeded to honour the letter of the sacred book, counting the words and very letters of it, and holding that there was a mysterious sacredness in their very form. And for their idolatry they were permitted for ever to lose the spirit, which they sought not to find, and were slain by that letter on which they had such reliance. And in the same spirit they require of you at once to believe the book as the word of God, by one act of faith to adopt it, then to read it and bow down before what you read. That is, to make the book an idol, and then prostrate your soul unto it. And by so doing, you shall make your soul a timorous creature of superstition, or a blind worshipper of sounds and sentences, but never a child of the Spirit of God. . . . What portion of the Holy Spirit is in the written word, he only shall be a judge of who hath the same inspiration with Himself. It is the Spirit in us which discerneth the Spirit in the word. And then it is not letters and sounds that we discern, but the things signified, the ideas revealed, which beget in us such mighty revolutions. This, also, like the others, is an effort to infix in the outward object of the written word all that is necessary to our salvation, to concreate the Spirit into matter, if I may so speak, and have the whole efficacy of the Godhead under our eye, or our understanding, or some other of our proper faculties, and to make religion consist in the right use of that outward thing. But no; the Lord hath better determined that it shall never be so, and hath kept the finishing of salvation still with Himself, in order that He may have a purchase over God-avoiding man, to draw him to the only portion of his blessedness. Therefore, He will not concreate His Spirit in the matter of a book, nor make Him subject to any given formula of man's resolution, simple or subtle; but as the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh nor whither it goeth, so hath He resolved that it shall be with His Spirit, that men may learn to draw near unto His throne, and entreat the perfection of His gifts from that grace from which they have derived so much.'—Vol. iv. p. 82.

When Irving penned these words, was he totally blind to the consequences which logically flow from them? Could he not perceive that the legitimate outcome was the choice between two alternatives: either set up the intellect as supreme judge, and treat Scripture 'like any other book,' which, of course, implies venerating it no more than any other book; or take

refuge in the Church as the witness, custodian, and interpreter of the Scriptures? Did it never flash upon his mind—that splendid mind, like a rare, large gem, cut into numerous facets, from which the varied beams of truth were reflected with such gorgeous beauty—that to treat of the inspiration of Holy Scripture, apart from, and independent of, the inspiration of the Church, is a vain toil, and barren of any solid, lasting advantage?

We have now arrived at the last volume of this edition, misnamed the 'Collected Writings of Edward Irving.'<sup>1</sup> It contains the book which, of all his works, is of the deepest interest as regards the author: 'The Doctrine of the Incarnation opened, in Six Lectures.' The theological value of this book is, in our judgment, subordinate to its biographical value. We adhere to the opinion, which we expressed four years ago, that for us, as churchmen, the doctrinal extravagances of a Presbyterian have no vital import. Nevertheless, we must own to having read this work with very great interest, not only on account of the place it takes in Irving's life as the declaration of his faith upon the cardinal doctrine which it discusses, and as having provided a fulcrum upon which his opponents rested the lever of their *odium theologicum*, and hoisted him out of the Kirk; but also because it reveals depths of thought and powers of argument which prove that Irving's mental fibre had not deteriorated from its early vigour and elasticity, notwithstanding the wear and tear of the two different kinds of excitement to which it had so constantly and intensely been subjected ever since his arrival in London; on the one side the excitement of boundless popularity and increasing applause, on the other side the excitement of theological controversy embittered by envious detraction.

We shall follow the same course in dealing with the work on the Incarnation that we have adopted with respect to Irving's other writings, and endeavour to exhibit, as fairly as we can, and with as much fulness as our space will allow, the chief opinions which he advances in this book. We do not assume the position of judges. We do not take upon ourselves the functions of a court of heresy, and pretend to give sentence upon Irving's orthodoxy. We leave this to the judgment of our readers. They can come to what conclusion they please; and we shall content ourselves with remarking, that whatever that conclusion may be, it does not really involve consequences of

<sup>1</sup> A fly-leaf in volume v., dated August 3, 1865, announces the intention of publishing a 'Supplementary Volume consisting entirely of such [prophetical] writings, and including "The last Days," and the "Preliminary Discourse to Ben Ezra's 'Coming of Messiah in glory and majesty.''" This promise has not yet been fulfilled, and we have seen no advertisement of its being about to be fulfilled.

any serious importance, inasmuch as the opinions which it may condemn or endorse were held by a minister of another communion; and to his own communion Irving must stand or fall.

The title of the first lecture is: 'That the Origin of the Mystery, that the Eternal Word should take unto Himself a Body, is the Holy Will and good pleasure of God.' In it, and also in other parts of the work, Irving gives expression to very decided opinions and objections concerning current views of the Atonement. We extract a few specimens:—

'Ignorant men take upon them to scoff at this great work of the Incarnation, as if it were a substitution of the innocent instead of the guilty, against all reason and justice, and to the subversion of all reason and justice in the breasts of men.'—Vol. v. p. 21.

'I consider it to be rather a low view of the Redeemer's work to contemplate it so much in the sense of acute bodily suffering, or to enlarge upon it under the idea of a price or a bargain, which is a carnal similitude, suitable and proper to the former carnal dispensation, and which should, as much as possible, be taken away for the more spiritual idea of our sanctification by the full and perfect obedience which Christ rendered unto the will of God; thereby purchasing back, and procuring for as many as believe in Him, their justification and sanctification by the Holy Spirit, which is their conformity to the will of God. For whosoever is brought into conformity with the will of God is thereby included in His purpose. It was a great act of power in the Son—a demonstration of His almighty power—to take up flesh and purify it against all the powers of hell—to take up flesh and purify it against all the powers of sin and corruption. But no one will say it was impossible, for it hath been accomplished; and no one will say that there was any violation of the principles of eternal holiness and justice, for the Son to do what was within His power, or for His Father to suffer Him to do it.'—Vol. v. p. 25.

'By His Divine nature, I say, with the Godhead, He (Christ) transacteth, and by His human nature He rendereth the will and purpose and action of the Godhead intelligible, visible, and perceptible to the creature. But before two instruments will render the same harmonious sound, they must be brought into tune with one another; and the question is, How shall human nature in the fallen state be brought to be in harmony with the acting of the holy Godhead? Ever since the fall, God and man have been at variance. The thing was not, that ever the human will had acted in harmony with the will Divine; and how then is it now to be? How is a human nature to respond, truly and justly, in all things to a Divine nature? This is reconciliation of which so much is made mention in Scripture. This is the atonement of which they make so much discourse without knowing what they say or whereof they affirm. Atonement is not reparation, is not the cost or damage, but the being at one. It should be pronounced at-one-ment.'—Vol. v. p. 160.

'The Church has been so spoiled in its tenderer and nobler parts, by the continual and exclusive doctrine of debt and payment, of barter and exchange, of suffering for suffering, of clearing the account and setting things straight with God, that she hath lost the relish for discourse of the brotherly covenant, of the spousal relation, of the consubstantial union betwixt her and the Lord Jesus. She hath lost relish for high discourse concerning the mystery of His power, as God-Man; the beauty, the grace, the excellency of that constitution of being which He possessed. Strong as the strongest, even of almighty strength; weak as the weakest,—of all

infirmities conscious ; holy as the holiest, the only holy thing, yet consubstantial with the sinful creature, sinful in the substance as they, tempted as they, liable to fall as they. The Church likewise, by this profit-and-loss theology, by this divinity of the exchange, hath come to lose the relish of that most noble discourse, which treateth of the grandeur and the glory of the risen Christ, wielding the sceptre of the heavens, yet, from His peerless height of place, consenting to cast his eye perpetually upon the poorest, the meanest, the most deeply-tried and overwhelmed of all His people.—Vol. v. p. 225.

The point upon which the Irving controversy chiefly turned was, as our readers are aware, the peccability of Christ. That unguarded expressions and horrifying language should have been used in the heat of argument concerning so profound and awful a mystery as the perfection of our Lord's human nature, is what any one would expect with certainty, and the devout would look for with fear and trembling. But whatever statements Irving may have been impelled by his opponents to make in the pamphlets and letters which were called forth by the controversy, and also from the pulpit while it was raging, it would be difficult to bring an indictment against him on the serious charge of blasphemy—as his antagonists did not scruple to do—if this work on the Incarnation be taken as the source of evidence. We believe that the *catena* of passages we subjoin will faithfully exhibit the writer's tone when dealing with so solemn a subject :—

'By which frequent reiteration and various illustration of our Lord's sinlessness, the Apostle having prepared the way, &c. [referring to 1 S. Peter ii. 23].—Vol. v. p. 37.

'The Son Himself became outwardly manifest in manhood by the power of the Holy Ghost, and by His power was exalted from the grave to His present supereminency. It is the mighty working of the Holy Spirit which is conducting all things through the same perilous voyage of outward and separate existence, to reconduct them back again into a condition of outward stability and unchanging reality ; such as by the Father from all eternity they were really and substantially seen in the person of His own Son, in the Eternal Word, and all-perfect image of Himself. The only change or alteration, therefore, consisteth in revelation or in manifestation : there is nothing which hath not been eternally known to, and present in, the Son ; even the possibility of sin itself, which is, as it were, the chaotic basis out of which the manifestation of holiness and righteousness cometh.'—Vol. v. p. 75.

The last sentence in this passage must not be passed by without a remark. Irving's great proposition, which he laboured to establish with such painful exercise of his thinking and declaiming powers, was this : the substance which Christ took of the Virgin was the substance of fallen humanity. In this way he understood the article, 'man of the substance of His mother born in the world.' But what has the startling statement of the last-quoted passage, that 'the possibility of sin was eternally known to, and present in, the Son,' to do with this ? Here we have one of those extravagant departures from his line of argu-

ment, objectionable in themselves, and not pertinent to the main subject, which exposed him—and not without reason, certainly, in this instance—to a charge of fundamental error. Between positive truth and positive error there is a wide debateable region of speculation. Irving wandered very wildly over this region; and though a charitable view of his teaching may lead one to believe that he would ultimately seek rest and find a fixed abode in the domain of truth, there is too much colour given to the uncharitable disposition which his persecutors so plainly manifested of settling him ultimately in the domain of positive error—which is formal heresy. But let us resume our chain of evidence:—

‘And what is this wonderful constitution of the Christ of God? It is the substance of the Godhead in the person of the Son, and the substance of the creature in the state of fallen manhood, united, yet not mixed, but most distinct for ever. And is this all? No: this is not all. With humility be it spoken, but yet with truth and verity, that the fallen humanity could not have been sanctified and redeemed by the union of the Son alone; which directly leadeth unto an imixing and confusing of the Divine with the human nature, that pestilent heresy of Eutyches. The human nature is thoroughly fallen; and without a thorough communication, inhabitation, and empowering of a Divine substance, it cannot be brought up pure and holy. The mere apprehension of it by the Son doth not make it holy. Such a union leads strictly to the apotheosis or deification of the creature, and this again does away with the mystery of the Trinity in the Godhead.’—Vol. v. p. 123.

‘I am unfolding no change in the eternal and essential Divinity of the Son, which is unchangeable, being very God of very God; but I am unfolding certain changes which passed upon the humanity, and by virtue of which the humanity was brought from the likeness of fallen sinful flesh, through various changes, unto that immortality and incorruption and Sovereign Lordship whereunto it hath now attained, and wherein it shall for ever abide.’—Vol. v. p. 133.

‘Do I say, then, that Christ was sinful, or did any sin, or that His temptations led Him into any sin? If there was sin, how could there be reconciliation? No; He was holy. But was He liable to sin? Yes; He was tempted in all points like as we are. How could He be tempted like me, unless He were like me? His Godhead could not be tempted. . . . Only, then, His manhood could be tempted. And how can any one be tempted or tried, unless he be liable to sin? Even Adam, before he fell, was liable to sin. If any one, therefore, say, that Christ was not liable to sin, he doth say He was not a man; he doth say He is not come in the flesh.’—Vol. v. p. 158.

‘It is very painful indeed to me, but nothing new, as you can testify, to witness the obstinacy and perverseness with which men contend against this truth, that Christ came in the likeness of sinful flesh, to condemn sin in the flesh. What mean they by their ignorant gainsaying? Is it not the thing which is to be done in you and me, sooner or later, by God, that we should be sanctified and redeemed, this very flesh of ours, by the indwelling and empowering of the Holy Ghost? . . . Do I become a devil, by wrestling with the devil and overcoming him? And doth Christ become sinful, by coming into flesh like this of mine, extirpating its sin, arresting its corruption, and attaining for it honour and glory for ever? — Vol. v. p. 218.



As we quote these extracts—and we must confess that it has been to us a painful task—we find arising to our lips continually the question, What becomes of that article of the Creed, ‘was conceived by the Holy Ghost?’ Has it not been lost sight of by our author in his eager anxiety to set forth what he deems to be the full meaning of that other article (or rather of the latter part of the same article), ‘born of the Virgin Mary’? We feel more and more convinced that Irving was an illustrious example of the truth, that no man—and still less a man of great mental power, and of deep fervour—can bend the whole force of his mind exclusively upon one point of doctrine without, sooner or later, throwing out of equilibrium the entire body of the catholic faith.

It will be observed that very many of these passages are taken from the third lecture, the title of which, ‘The Method [of the Incarnation] is by taking up the fallen Humanity,’ exhibits in the most concise form the doctrine which Irving held. This lecture extends over 144 pages, and is divided into four parts. Whether these parts exhibit so many preached sermons we do not know. If they do, then we can understand the complaints of the prodigious length of Irving’s sermons and prayers, and how his almost cruel disregard of exhausted nature, and the urgent punctuality of the dinner-hour, tried to the uttermost his greatest admirers. And yet he seemed to think that he had reason to complain of being obliged to curtail his discourses in deference to custom. In one place in this volume he says: ‘Your time does not permit me to follow out this part of my subject at present. The more is your loss, the more also is mine, and, what is more, the loss of Christ’s Church, that our customs should always step in just when we have passed the porch of the sanctuary of truth, and debar us of the feast for feasts of another kind.’ Who could have heard this without a smile? The cool assumption of the importance of his own exposition of doctrine would have argued ridiculous conceit in any other man; but from him, knowing what he was, we accept it as part of the intense earnestness with which he strove to proclaim in all its fulness what he believed to be the truth.

The quotations we have made have been selected with a view to giving our readers as clear a statement of Irving’s doctrinal position in its several particulars as possible. But there remains one long passage which we shall append as a conspectus of his whole teaching, with regard to the Incarnation.

‘Into the mystery of the union between the Divine and human nature, it is hard to enter; and those who have dared it too far have most frequently lost themselves in error. It is revealed that His body was created by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary,

that He might be the woman's seed, according to the promise. He grew in wisdom as He grew in years, like any other child; though He was from the womb the very word of God, which had created the heavens and the earth, and spoken by the mouth of all the prophets: who was conscious of the eternity of His being, and of the blessedness thereof, before the world was. And He was obedient to the Law, in its letter and in its spirit; and He made the word of God His meditation, as we do; and He lived by faith upon it, as do all His people. He prayed, and was strengthened by prayer, as we are: He was afflicted with all our afflictions, and tried with all our trials, and was sustained by the power of the Holy Ghost, even as we. For we are not to suppose, with the early heretics, that His body was only an appearance, or illusion, but a real manifestation of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity as man. He was not the Only-begotten in the bosom of the Father at the same time that He was the Messiah on earth; but He was the Only-begotten come out of the bosom of the Father, in order to become the Messiah upon earth. The Word had been revealed in the universal creation once, but now He is to be revealed in the individual man. In the former work the individual was seen in the universal; in the latter the universal is to be revealed in the individual, and gathered into Him. It was a high honour put upon human nature; but it was for a very high object; which we know only in part, and which will doubtless illustrate the being and glory of the Godhead more than the creation of the heavens and the earth. No wonder that the Word of God, foreseeing this great act of His incarnation, should speak of it by the mouth of all His prophets: for it is a singular act, whose extraordinary wonderfulness shall reach through all eternity. No wonder that the rumour of it came before, nor that sacrifice should be instituted to signify it, and the tabernacle to witness it, and the temple to confirm it, and the whole Jewish State to be, as it were, the womb of this great conception; in the foresight of which the prophet burst forth so sublimely: "For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon His shoulder; and His name shall be called "Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The "Prince of Peace." He was anointed to His holy office by the Spirit in the form of a dove; and declared to be the Son of God whom the people were to hear. And it was by the Spirit that He was led into temptation; and it was by the Spirit that the man Jesus Christ prevailed. Whatever powers He might possess otherwise, it is certain He prevailed against Satan by that Word and Spirit by which we are to prevail. He was travelling in the valley of humility; and it was no pretence of doing, but it was so. He was emptied: He did not seem to be emptied, but He was so. And He preached by the Holy Spirit, which was upon Him, and with which He had been anointed. And in the power of the Holy Spirit He went about doing good, and healing them that were possessed "with the devil." And the Chief Shepherd of the Sheep offered Himself by the Eternal Spirit. And He was justified in the Spirit, by the resurrection from the dead. So that in very deed, and in very truth, He was the Man Christ Jesus, the Son of man, the second Adam; who hath now joined the human nature to the Divine, and is become a quickening Spirit; baptizing with the Holy Spirit all who believe in His name and receive Him as the Prophet of God; bestowing the regeneration of the Holy Ghost, the fellowship of His priesthood, and the inheritance of His glorious kingdom."—Vol. v. p. 267.

Here we close these volumes. We have, for lack of space, been compelled to omit even to mention the titles of some of

their contents; but more than enough has been cited to afford ample materials for forming a conception of Irving's characteristics as a theological writer. The reader will observe, in the first place, that he was thorough. He never took up a subject but he looked at it in every aspect, he emptied it of all the teaching it could be made to yield, he illustrated it with all the variousness of his fertile imagination. He was not a suggestive writer, but he was pre-eminently an exhaustive one. He not only struck out a thought, but he followed it up likewise, and never relaxed from the pursuit so long as there was a point left for discussion. His brilliant mind scintillated sparks, but he did not leave it to others to kindle fires by them, but he kindled fires himself, which burnt out to the last flame of his glowing language. In no single place that has passed under our eye have we detected poverty of thought, or meagreness of expression. He is never to be caught beating out his matter thin to cover a space, but his mind always appears overflowing with exuberant wealth. Nowhere does the thread of his discourse outrun the staple of his argument.

The next most noteworthy feature in Irving's writings is sincerity. All he says he heartily believes, and he is passionately anxious that every one else should believe the same. Considering how voluminous and varied his writings are, it is most remarkable how free they are from all symptoms of hesitancy. With Irving there were no open questions. It was intolerable to him to leave the beam quivering in doubtfulness. Indecision upon any point of doctrine would have appeared to him no better than falsehood in the attitude of alarm. He was terribly in earnest in all he said, and this oftentimes imparts an air of overbearing assurance to his mode of stating his own views. Irving was not really intolerant. Indeed, there are many passages in his life which prove him to have been exceedingly large-minded in his sympathies with Christians not of his own communion. But he never suspected himself of errors; he always took for granted that his own course was in the line of orthodoxy; and this made much of what he wrote wear a harsh, and almost bigoted, appearance.

As a natural concomitant of his thoroughness and sincerity, the courage of Irving's writings is obvious on every page. The unsparing satire with which he pilloried the 'Evangelicals,' 'Bible Christians,' and the 'religious world,' has been already remarked; and such a sentence as this may stand as an example of his passing cuts: 'This is particularly the shortcoming of those who call themselves Evangelical, and of all who are wont to pride themselves in being *Bible Christians*: and I am sorry it hath seized too many of the intellectual men of the Church

'of Scotland, who should know better.' Nor was his bravery of one sort only. He would acknowledge with frankness his obligations to the literature of the Roman Church for assistance which he failed to find in the literature of Protestantism. Alluding to Acts ii. 24, he says: 'To me they open a great 'deep, in the coasting of which I find little help or guidance 'from our clear-headed Protestant divines, but not a little from 'many of the fathers of the primitive, and some of the mystics 'of the Roman Catholic Church.' Such sallies of pulpit courage remind one of Massillon's bold utterances before the court of Louis XIV.; as, for example, when in the year 1709,—that year in which the dire distress of the poor contrasted so frightfully with the self-indulgence of the nobles, as to make every word about the origin of property a spark that might set the country ablaze,—he did not flinch from exclaiming, 'Qui 'l'ignore, que tous les biens appartoient originairement à tous 'les hommes en commun; que la simple nature ne connoissoit, 'ni de propriété, ni de partage; et qu'elle laissoit d'abord chacun 'de nous en possession de tout l'univers?'<sup>1</sup>—which, by-the-by, reminds us of Robertson's famous 'socialist' sermon on Nabal. And, indeed, Irving's courage cost him dear. Envy was on the alert,—envy in the bitterest form which it can assume; that, namely, which is kindled in the breasts of 'stickit ministers' by the popularity of a more eloquent and successful brother. Irving was bold even to rashness, and laid himself open to creeping informers. How he fell we know from Mrs. Oliphant's graphic pages; and whenever we recall to mind how 'one Cole, a clergyman,' having taken ample leisure from his own duties, busied himself to find accusations against Irving, we always think of Shakespeare's lines:—

'A falcon, towering in her pride of place,  
Was by a mousing owl hawk'd at and kill'd.'

Something remains to be said about Irving's style as a writer, though not much; for we have quoted so extensively from his works, that our readers are in possession of abundant materials for forming their own opinions. There are many blemishes in his earlier writings which do not appear in his later; there are many faults, too, which cling to his compositions throughout. His first book is disfigured by the use of archaic and provincial term; and all his books display an affectation of that solemn and ponderous phraseology which carries the mind back to the literature of the Puritan age. The expression 'boon nature,' is quaint, but this scarcely excuses its eccentricity. The phrase

<sup>1</sup> Œuvres de Massillon, tom. iv. 137. (1810.)

'it irks the heart,' is a Scotticism, for which, of course, there is an apology in the writer's nationality; and it, at least, is intelligible to the English reader: but will the same apology serve for such an expression as this — 'there they lie in chains of darkness *dreeing* the everlasting penance'? Again, the purer taste of his later days would surely have blotted out such a sentence as this:— 'A thousand angels of darkness are aye *'endeavouring to scarf up* the bright sign of mercy in the 'heavens.' What does he mean? 'Scarving' is a technical word with joiners; and an affected blue-stocking might use it to express the putting on of her shawl, but Irving had no business with it. And yet he seems to have admired it, for in another place he talks of 'scarving up of the glory of the everlasting Word.' We have also such obsolete phrases as, 'A *stound* of pain,' 'thrènes of despair,' 'reaved away,' 'vie them in Thy hot displeasure.' It should be remarked that the whole of these examples are taken from his earliest essay in literature—the 'Argument for Judgment to Come;' and that that work exhibits a larger proportion of such faults than any other of equal extent. But the defects in Irving's style sink into insignificance when placed by the side of its merits. If he indulged now and then in Scotticisms or archaisms, he always used them with a vigour which went far to extenuate the liberty he took; if his sentences be occasionally turgid and grandiose in their wording, they cannot be called pointless or feeble; if his command of language led him sometimes into prolixity, it never betrayed him into obscurity; and, although his tropes and similitudes are now and then inappropriate and grotesque, they are far oftener happy and sublime. Irving is one of the few writers who combine clearness of statement with grandeur of language. He launches forth boldly upon the sea of speculation, and never loses himself, or bewilders his reader. There is no flight of rhetoric too lofty for him to attempt, and in no attempt is he ever baffled. It was said of Gibbon, in contrast with Hume, that while the latter writes up to the subject, the former gives the idea of writing down to it; and so of Irving it may truly be remarked, that we trace in his works the master's rather than the labourer's hand. His eloquence is yet fresh in the memories of men now living; and when we compare the traditions which cling to his name with the evidence which is furnished by his writings, we conclude that his pulpit oratory was not simply impressive: it must have been overwhelming.

ART. III.—*The Holy Roman Empire.* By JAMES BRYCE, B.C.L.  
Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. A New Edition, revised.  
London: Macmillan and Co. 1866.

THE calm which has reigned almost unbroken in Europe for the last fifty years has passed away for ever. A short time since we were looking with anxious gaze and bated breath for the issue of those disastrous civil wars of America, which seem to have frustrated the last sibylline vaticination, and delayed for centuries the westward march of empire. We were happily and serenely unconscious of that strange counter-revolution which was ready to burst out in the Old World; and which now, by its incalculable issues, has changed, if it has not darkened, the whole prospect of Europe. In America revolution aimed at the emancipation of nations; in Europe it has crushed the independence of kingdoms. With a cruel mockery, under the sacred pretexts of unity and fatherland, mere force has imperilled the freedom of the Continent; and, if the forebodings of many be not frustrated, Sadowa will yet take rank as the most disastrous, alike to vanquisher and vanquished, among the hitherto so-called victories of the world. For more than five centuries the Turks have done good service to Europe, by enforcing caution and watchfulness among Christian nations. The Ottomans have now sunk into such abject degradation and decrepitude that politicians have allowed themselves to be betrayed into forgetfulness of the fact that the Crescent represents, not a people, but a religion. How far the changes on the Continent during the last century might have been modified or arrested had the Turkish empire been animated with its original energies it is needless to speculate; but it is remarkable—and it illustrates the permanence of historical ideas—that what we understand by the Turkish question has acquired from recent events increased prominence and interest; and this, and not the possible absorption of Denmark by Bismark, and the *avatar* of a Brandenburgian Empire, or the appropriation by the Czar of Norway and Sweden, remains the great political crux of the cabinets of Christendom.

The events which we have just referred to, the demolition of the Austrian Empire, and the re-organization of a mid-continental federation, have taken place with a rapidity which seems quite in keeping with an age whose glory is in steam and telegraphs and needle-guns. We are at this moment manufacturing history with super-electrical velocity. It is the more needful that we should take stock of our old historical acquirements, and review



our knowledge of the past, that we may the better appreciate history as it is born to us day by day. There is no employment more necessary to, more worthy of, man. It is one of the attributes of his nature that he is the student of those revelations of God's opposeless will to which have been vouchsafed no inspired narrator; that he is a judge of the dead, great and small; of the actions and the passions of the mighty and the low; and that he is called to witness the sure evolution of the Tragedy of the Empires.

And in this historical review no department, if we may call it a department, possesses more interest than that treated of in Mr. Bryce's masterly and modest volume; a volume whose judicial and impressive tone, and clear and far insight into the complications of the subject, vindicate the writer's claim to that great title of historian so often assumed in our day, so rarely deserved. The subject of Mr. Bryce's volume is specially in season just now, when the temporal possessions of the Bishop of Rome are so seriously enjeopardized; and the bewildered Pope, wavering between malisons and benedictions, seems to know neither the time when, nor the person whom, he ought to curse or bless.

We invite our readers to run over with us the subject of Mr. Bryce's volume. We shall endeavour, by a few introductory remarks, to place in as clear a light as we can the connexion of the subject with antecedent history. We cannot help indeed differing with Mr. Bryce on at least one point. He speaks of the empire surrendered in 1806 as 'the same which the crafty nephew of Julius had won for himself against the powers of the east, beneath the cliffs of Actium,' which 'had preserved almost unaltered through eighteen centuries of time, a title,' &c. (p. 1.) The question of identity we are aware is a very nice one; yet in this case it seems cleared of most of its debateableness. Neither in idea, name, area, or historical succession was the empire of Charlemagne one with that of Augustus. Not in idea—for that of Augustus was in idea secular, uniform,<sup>1</sup> and universal; and that of Charlemagne was local, complex, and marked by an ecclesiastical character. Not in name as is evident: not in area, for that of Charlemagne was confined to Europe, and to only a part,<sup>2</sup> less than the original Roman conquests in Europe: not in historical succession, for at least 324 years elapsed between the extinction of the Roman Empire of the West, and the establishment of the Holy Roman Empire. The system organized by Charlemagne was 'not unworthy' of the title it

<sup>1</sup> Charlemagne's two-headed eagle expressed the union of the Empires of Germany and Rome.

*Vide* Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall,' chap. xlix.

assumed ; but as a fact—and a fact, too, the oversight or neglect of which is sure to entail infinite puzzleheadedness—the Holy Roman Empire as much represents the great old Roman Empire as Napoleon III. represents legitimacy and the divine hereditary right of Charlemagne.

Mr. Bryce does not attempt a history of events, but he aims at exhibiting his subject as an institution 'created by and embodying a wonderful system of ideas.' If so we must more or less connect the institution with the previous state of things. The Roman Empire, in the second century, had grown to be the centre of the world ; and in that world an unexpected unity was given to the empire by Caracalla's decree of political universalism. This curious anticipation of the supermiraculous gift of the Gospel, the equal citizenship of the poor in the Kingdom, failed, as might be expected of such a scheme, to work unity ; and Diocletian, by his dividing the empire into four parts, and Constantine, by his introduction of that court ceremonial which has continued from him to us, rendered that unity more unreal, while for the time the fiction of universal sovereignty was more zealously affirmed. When Constantine adopted the Church it was already a great political force ; but, though the league was formed, a perfect identification between Church and State—such as had existed between Church and State in the Jewish system, such as had existed in pagan Rome between its political constitution and its recognised religious forms—was providentially rendered impossible by the existence and permanent recognised establishment within the Church of the ministry and sacraments. Mr. Bryce's theory is, that in consequence of this obstructiveness in her own system, the Church had no 'course left but to become the counterpart' of the State ; and that she thus, under the combined force of doctrinal theory and practical needs, shaped for herself a machinery of patriarchs, metropolitans, and bishops. This is a very curious theory, yet natural enough in a Scotchman ; but certainly neither ingenious nor new. The theory, however, is not necessary to the obvious and unquestionless truth that the Christian idea of unity contributed to the unification of the Roman Empire. The same political system was working itself out in another direction, and after another method. Romans admitted barbarians to rank and office ; and the Teutonic tribes were recognised. The religious, the social, and political system which they were admitted to share must have exercised a very remarkable control over them ; for, with the exception of Attila, all Rome's conquerors were conquered by Rome, all were softened and subdued ; and save Athaulf, Alaric's brother-in-law, no barbarian appears to have entertained for a moment the desire to extinguish the Roman Empire.

This influence of Rome over her enemies is traceable to two great impressions produced by Rome. The first of these was the idea of Rome's eternity, which again was the result of her universality. The second great element in this conception was the sanctity of the imperial name. 'Where the emperor is, there is Rome.' He was consecrated and worshipped. Our author observes that 'under the new religion the form of adoration vanished.' Yet Gibbon tells us that 'like the Cæsars, he (Charlemagne) was saluted or adored by the pontiff,' and Mr. Bryce's own authorities for other facts testify to this also. Perhaps nothing can more thoroughly illustrate the power of an idea than the conduct of Odoacer the Herulian. When Romulus Augustulus, the last native Cæsar of Rome, was deposed, a deputation went to Constantinople to Zeno, begging him that, as no second emperor was needed, he would bestow proper dignity on Odoacer, as his vicegerent. With this petition the emperor complied; and the Herulian, who had the power to extinguish the whole western power of Rome, was content to take the title of King Odoacer.<sup>1</sup> Thus, in fact, things reverted to what in a great measure had been their state during the first two centuries. But the consequences were most unfriendly to the unity of the empire. For this arrangement 'developed Latinism, it emancipated the popes, it gave a new character to the projects and government of the 'Teutonic rulers of the West.' But the first to attempt to blend the peoples and maintain the traditions of Roman wisdom in the hands of a new and vigorous race, was Theodoric the Ostrogoth, 'the forerunner of the first barbarian emperor.' Yet even he maintained his submission to the throne of Constantinople; and of the two annual consuls, one was always named by the emperor. After his death, Italy was temporarily recovered for Justinian by the arms of Belisarius, but the unity he restored perished and came to naught on the invasion of the Lombards in 568. Rome's 'two enduring witnesses, her Church and law,' survived, but they did not retrieve or stay when once begun the disintegration of the empire. 'As the empire fell to pieces, and the new kingdom began to dissolve'—as our author admits, the power and influence of the Church, as the centre, as that which furnishes the one abiding bond to society, began to be felt more and more. So, too, was it with the Roman code. But, permanent and powerful as we regard the Roman law, we cannot do more than admit that if 'in the eighth century the empire still existed in men's minds as a power not destroyed,' this is an instance of the unreasonableness and tyranny of the imagina-

<sup>1</sup> Not King of Italy. The barbarian kings for centuries did not assume territorial titles.

tion, and the too ready method with which most impressible minds mistake memories for facts. A kindred imagination prevails to our own day; and some of our modern Apocalypticists venture to maintain that the Roman Empire exists still. The Germanic empire of the great Charles implied the subjection of Italy to Germany: this was, we might say, avowed in the offer of Eribert, Archbishop of Milan, and the Lombard magnates, of the crown to Conrad.<sup>1</sup> At this very time, the southern provinces of Italy were faithful in their allegiance to the Eastern emperor. Yet Conrad III. just like his better-known nephew, Frederick Barbarossa, believed, or professed to believe, that magnificent absurdity that he inherited the kingdoms of the world as successor to Augustus, whose entire prerogatives he claimed to exercise over his subjects. It is at the very root of all we are urging, that in no trustworthy, no truly historical sense, can the Holy Roman Empire be called the restoration of the Western Empire. On this one point we think the philosophy of Mr. Bryce, if we understand him, is at fault; and philosophy, here as elsewhere, is truth, which must by no means be sacrificed to a passion for system.

That which was indeed the revival of the Roman Empire in conception, in self-assertion, and centralization, was the Hildebrandine Papacy; a phantom<sup>2</sup> only, it is true, as far as substantive manifestation of secular omnipotence is concerned, yet one that propagated throughout the world, and that from the old historical centre, a power veritably commensurate with the Roman empire in the West. The idea of Constantine, after struggling to maintain itself for a whole millennium, was finally extinguished when at the jubilee, A.D. 1300, Boniface VIII. presented himself to the astonished pilgrims, seated on the throne of Constantine, equipped with sword and crown and sceptre, and shouting aloud, 'I am Cæsar—I am Emperor.'<sup>3</sup>

But, while we protest against any fine-drawn theory which seems to justify the too common notion that the Augustan Empire of Rome was restored in the son of Pepin, and then flourished one thousand years, till 1806, we are of course free to confess that, through the whole process by which Pope and Frank conspired to convey—'convey the wise it call'—to themselves authority over and the actual possession of the dis-

<sup>1</sup> Hallam's 'Middle Ages,' vol. i. p. 223. Eighth Edition.

<sup>2</sup> We believe we are using here almost the words of the philosopher of Malmesbury.

<sup>3</sup> When Innocent III. compelled the Prefect of Rome to swear allegiance to him, an end was put to the regular imperial supremacy over that city. This is the proper era of that temporal sovereignty which has been ever since possessed and asserted without question or limit by the Bishop of Rome over their own city.

membered residue of what once had been the Western Roman Empire, they displayed a commendable ingenuity and discretion in endeavouring to surround their pretensions with all the prestige that could be gained by reviving the old imperial ideas of Augustan Rome. History abounds with instances in which a defective title or inadequate resources have sought support or replenishment in assertions the most extravagant, or pretensions the most outrageous. The founders of the Lower Empire had indeed two difficulties to face, and if possible to overcome. And they failed to overcome them. The one difficulty lay in the act of usurpation by which they ventured to seize the dominions of the emperor at Constantinople; the other difficulty lay in the fact that they never were masters of the city of Rome. It was but the convenient invention of some nameless sycophant, however afterwards adopted, that where the emperor is, there is Rome. It was an afterthought, much in the same way, which justified the usurpation on the grounds that, as the empire of the Cæsars had come under the rule of a guilty woman, the West was justified in vindicating its own independence. But, great and manifold as were the crimes of Irene—and Charlemagne, a suitor for her hand, in his ambitious purposes seems to have forgotten the iniquities of her life—it deserves to be remembered that her reign was so short—only some five years—as to be far from justifying this plea; and the rational method of rectifying the anomaly was to be found in restoring her injured son, and not in robbing the throne of its oldest possessions. Indeed the curious part of this whole passage in the history is that Charles not only usurped the Western Empire, but in a measure the Eastern likewise; and the annals of the time and many centuries afterwards mention Charles, not as the successor of Romulus Augustus, but of Irene's son, the deposed Constantine VI.; and the name of this unhappy emperor, the sixty-seventh from Augustus, is followed by that of Charles, the sixty-eighth.

The imperial purple had descended from the shoulders of the divine Augustus to Constantine and Theodosius, along a line which numbers forty-four emperors. The successors of Theodosius in an evil moment divided the empire. The seventy-first descendant of Arcadius in the East was that last of the true Cæsars, Constantine Palæologus, who perished in the sack of Constantinople by the Ottomans. Any pretensions which the Holy Roman empire might with any show of justice advance to be regarded as a restoration of the empire of Augustus must be based upon the Latin usurpation of the Eastern throne (1203—1261). But that event, so futile in itself, so damaging and discreditable to Christendom, has been industriously consigned to oblivion by the historians of our day. The empire of the West,

presided over by Honorius the son of Theodosius, was brought to a close by the Goths when that unhappy prince, already referred to, the double diminutives of whose name are only too suggestive of defeat and disaster, the tenth successor of Honorius, faded away. In 476 A.D. the empire of Rome proper had completed its millennium and its surplus hundred years; a period somewhat like the 'year and a day' of our nursery times. It came to an end then utterly and for evermore. Mr. Bryce speaks of taking in in one mental view the empire of Rome from Augustus to Charles, and looking on it as a whole; he says that this is most 'necessary'; to regard it as 'a single institution in which centres the history of eighteen centuries' (p. 433): he adds indeed that this is 'least possible to do.' We contend that it is not necessary, but wholly to be avoided; that, be the charm or the tyranny of ideas what it may, we must not submit to it; nor indulge a fancy as unreal and untrue as that of French writers, who look on their emperor as the historical heir of Charlemagne. The Lower Empire completed its appointed cycle. The same mystic cycle of a millennium and a century measures the duration of Rome proper, and is to be found in the Eastern Rome. From the middle of the fourth to the middle of the fifteenth century we measure an equal time:—from the foundation of Constantinople to its capture by the Turks.<sup>1</sup>

Among the nations which the disintegration of the old imperial system brought into prominence, the most remarkable were the Franks and Saxons. In their conversion from Paganism, while the Saxons had the misfortune to be converted by Arian missionaries, the Franks, among the very latest converts, were Catholics from the first. While the hostility of their orthodox subjects destroyed the Vandal kingdom of Africa and the Ostrogothic kingdom of Italy—the Franks, the descendants, namely, of the Sicambri, the inveterate enemies of the ancient empire—found the greatest possible support for their ambitious purposes in the widely diffused sympathy of the priesthood, which had suffered so much from their Burgundian and Visigothic enemies. The Franks had withstood the Saracens of Spain; they had aided the

<sup>1</sup> In the East 115 emperors are reckoned from Augustus to Constantine Palæologus; and in the West (if we reckon Charlemagne as the successor of Romulus Augustulus, as we reckon Louis XVIII. successor to Louis XVII.), we reckon to Francis II. (1806) 114. If from the 1453 years which the Eastern Empire lasted we subtract the three centuries and a few years, we have the approximate number of 1100 years. If, from 1806, to which date, *nomically*, the Western Empire lasted, we subtract the 324 years of its abeyance between Romulus and Charlemagne, we have 1482 years. Again, deduct from this the three centuries and more till Christendom and Paganism were adjusted to one another by Constantine, and we have still the former number, with a sufficient approximation, of a millennium and a century. We merely mention this as helpful to the memory.



missions of Boniface; and their position and their services alike commended them to the partial regards of the Bishop of Rome. In our endeavours to distinguish the epochs of history we define the period commonly known as the 'Dark Ages' to be the earlier centuries which succeeded the taking of Rome by the Goths: from that event at least down to the age of Charlemagne. Perhaps never in the history of the human race has there passed a time of such hopeless and unmitigated trouble. Acuter sufferings there doubtless have been within a shorter term: when the Divine Mercy for the elect's sake shortened the days. But in the three hundred years which followed the victory of Alaric sorrow was multiplied, and when we turn our eyes to the land, there is nothing to be seen there but darkness and sorrow, and the '*plurima mortis imago*.' That time of evil culminated in the settlement of the Lombards in Italy. Their attempts were concentrated about the valley of the Po, and, formidable as they were, they left the exarch of Ravenna to rule undisturbed the rest of the country in the name of the Eastern Emperor. Yet they made their presence unpleasantly felt at Rome; and, distinguished among all the northern tribes for their dislike to the clergy, they drove the ecclesiastical chief at Rome to seek succour where he could find it. By those who are partial to the study of historical coincidences, it will be welcome as a curious instance of this kind, that a theological question precipitated the overthrow of the old and the new empire. What Luther's solifidianism was to the successor of Charlemagne, the iconoclastic controversy was to the empire of the veritable Cæsars. It was the part taken by the Emperor Leo, the Isaurian, which formed the proximate cause for the alienation from the Byzantine Court of the Italian dependencies. In the crisis of the controversy, Luidprand, the Lombard king, with an astuteness which may be matched, but can hardly be outdone, by any modern instance of diplomatic duplicity, seized the golden moment. As a champion of images he overran the exarchate; and as the minister of the Greek emperor he all but captured Rome. At such a moment, placed between the imperial heretic and the royal brigand, and Lombardy has not failed to produce others like Luidprand, Gregory III. had no alternative but to seek help from Charles Martel, already the deliverer of Christendom on the field of Poitiers. Charles died ere he could come to the succour of Holy Church; and Pipin, the third of his family who virtually ruled the Franks, engaged, on the condition of the deposition of his master Childeric, to become the defender of the chair of Peter. There is something in this mean conspiracy greatly suggestive: and later events in the progress of the historical drama illus-

trate the divine certainty of that temporal retribution which overtakes governments. Twice Pipin came to the rescue of Rome; on the second time in compliance with a letter written in the name of S. Peter himself. The victorious French bestowed the exarchate on the pope, and the pope gave a title in return, and Pipin became Patrician,<sup>1</sup>—a dignity invented by Constantine himself, which, however exalted, and, especially in ecclesiastical matters, influential, implied subjection to the Byzantine emperor.

There was one further step necessary to the full extrication of the Bishop of Rome from his perilous state of exposure to his Lombard neighbours; and this step was taken when the son of Pipin, the chieftain so happy in having the title of his greatness incorporated in his name, put down the Lombard king, seized and assumed the Lombard crown, and, first of the Teuton kings, entered Rome in triumph. The situation was critical and memorable; and no wonder that some poetic mind, improving the occasion, turned his subjective impressions into an objective form, and wrought out the whole forgery of the donation, and the gratitude of Constantine, just healed of his leprosy, to Pope Sylvester. Hadrian received Charles. But Leo III. the same who sent the Frankish king the keys of the shrine and the confession of S. Peter, was the bishop to whom history is indebted for the first conception of the Lower Empire. In his weak and unsheltered condition the first principle of self-preservation would naturally assert itself: but we may give credit to Leo for a larger and more far-sighted policy. The grand memories of imperial Rome were yet alive among the nations; they were inextricably bound up with the law, the language, the religion of humanity. And, as if to impart a still greater vitality to the idea, another conqueror had come after the divine Julius, who had established one law, one religion, and one empire consolidated alike in Europe, Africa, and Asia. The suggestion was not to be put aside. The pope must have a temporal power at hand. Here was one already king of many races, who had in Saracen and Lombard overthrown the spiritual and temporal enemies of the Church; the Byzantine throne was at the moment occupied by the cruel Irene; no time was to be lost. The Frank entered Rome, and at a moment when he least expected it, when there can be little doubt that, if consulted, he would have declined the honour as, however to be desired, ill-timed, Charlemagne was crowned by the pope on Christmas-day, 800.

<sup>1</sup> The first, if we regard Gibbon as mistaken in giving that title to Charles Martel.

There is much the same kind of difficulty in forming a satisfactory estimate of Charlemagne as there is in judging Constantine. Gibbon, whose marvellous historical knowledge and, where Christianity is not *directly* concerned, uniform discernment are so rarely at fault, is severe enough in his delineation of the founder of the Lower Empire. That delineation is one continued sneer. And in truth, if the claims of Charlemagne to be accounted a hero after fifty-three indecisive expeditions, in which he fought with the troops and not with the success or the glory of his great predecessor, cannot be better verified than his claims to be accounted a saint—in the verification of which blazon his nine wives cannot easily be disposed of—the sooner he is reduced to his true proportions the better.<sup>1</sup> In his laws Gibbon sees nothing of the spirit of a legislator. In his encouragement of learning he finds his highest title to the gratitude of posterity. 'His real merit,' Gibbon remarks in a very Gibbonian sentence, 'is doubtless enhanced by the barbarism of the nation and the times from which he emerged; but the *apparent* magnitude of an object is likewise enlarged by an unequal comparison; and the ruins of Palmyra derive a casual splendour from the nakedness of the surrounding desert.'<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Bryce, on the other hand, sees in the rosiest light all that concerns Charlemagne; he goes so far as to assert against Gibbon and his own authorities (p. 60) that 'under the new religion the form of adoration vanished.' At all events, there can be no doubt that it was observed at the outset. In his comments on the coronation Mr. Bryce admirably observes:—

'It was just because everything was left thus undetermined, resting not upon express stipulation, but rather on a sort of mutual understanding, a sympathy of beliefs and wishes which augured no evil, that the event admitted of being afterwards represented in so many different lights. Four centuries later, when papacy and empire had been forced into the mortal struggle by which the fate of both was decided, three distinct theories regarding the coronation of Charles will be found advocated by three different parties, all of them plausible, all of them to some extent misleading. The Suabian emperors held the crown to have been won by their great predecessor as the prize of conquest, and drew the conclusion that the citizens and Bishop of Rome had no rights as against themselves. The patriotic party among the Romans, appealing to the early history of the empire, declared that by nothing but the voice of their senate and people could an emperor be lawfully created, he being only their chief magistrate, the temporary depository of their power. The popes pointed to the indisputable fact that Leo imposed the crown, and argued that as God's earthly vicar it was his, and continued to be their, right to give to

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Hallam has satisfactorily disposed of the hideous charge against Charlemagne which Gibbon thought he had authority for.

<sup>2</sup> Decline and Fall, chap. xlix.

whomsoever they would an office which was created to be the handmaid of their own. Of these three it was the last view that eventually prevailed, yet to an impartial eye it cannot claim, any more than do the two others, to contain the whole truth. Charles did not conquer, nor the Pope give, nor the people elect. As the act was unprecedented so was it illegal: it was a revolt of the ancient Western capital against a daughter who had become a mistress: an exercise of the sacred right of insurrection, justified by the weakness and wickedness of the Byzantine princes, hallowed to the eyes of the world by the sanction of Christ's representative, but founded upon no law, nor competent to create any for the future.'—Pp. 63, 64.

The peculiar illegality of the whole transaction lies in this: that, as admitted by Mr. Bryce himself, and it appears to us admitted somewhat inconsistently, 'The very memory of the 'separate Western Empire as it had existed from Theodosius 'to Odoacer had long since been lost, and neither Charles nor 'Leo dreamt of reviving it. Besides, the empire was on all 'hands held to be one and indivisible. The coronation was, 'middle, beginning, and ending, both immoral and illegal; and, 'viewed as the act of a spiritual person, was a mistake as well 'as a crime. It not only called into existence a power which 'the Bishop of Rome felt himself afterwards compelled, by measures the least worthy of the representative of Christ and the 'Holy Ghost, to plot against, and cheat, and undermine; but it 'rendered perpetual those calamitous divisions between the 'Eastern and Latin Churches which, while all other consequences of the transaction have passed away, have survived, 'with all their animosities unabated, to our day.' Nor can the plea against the regimen of women on the throne of the Cæsars be really urged in justification by the friends of the pope, for Leo was a successor of that pontiff who had availed himself of Irene's power, and recognised her right to convene (in her son's name) the Second Council of Nicæa. The earliest occurrence perhaps on which we can fix the temporal recognition of the Western Empire is the treaty offensive between Basil the Macedonian and Louis the great-grandson of Charlemagne, in order to drive the Saracens out of Italy. There was an immediate Nemesis. The pope had broken with the Byzantine emperor because of his iconoclastic heresies. The earliest trouble which overtook the pope from the Western emperor was that contained in the decrees of the Council of Frankfurt, with its three hundred bishops lawfully convened under the imperial warrant, and honoured with the presence of the papal legates. That Council as firmly condemned image worship as the Eastern Church had done; and Charlemagne called upon Pope Hadrian to recant. Indeed the pope seemed to be in the first instance a loser by the establishment of the empire. Like Frankenstein

in the tale, the power his skill had called into being seemed already too much for him. Charles ruled the popes. Whatever his exploits in diplomacy and war, in letters and in peace, we cannot discover anything in his career save this fact, which will justify the eulogium of Mr. Bryce, that 'his magnificent works' recall 'the projects of Alexander and Cæsar.'

The empire of Charlemagne, whether made or blessed or both by the pope, upon the death of Charlemagne melted away like hoar-frost in the sun, after a duration like that of our own Stuarts: and when the judgment on the third and fourth generation was exhausted, the succession passed into the female line. On the failure of the main line of the eastern branch, the people accepted Conrad the Franconian, and after him Henry, the second duke, both representing the female line. The latter's ambitious plans, prematurely cut short by death, were left to be carried out by his son Otto the Great. The coronation of Charlemagne had been the completion of the great movement southwards of the German tribes; but the power then established was not itself to last. The division of the empire among, and the intellectual feebleness of, his successors hastened its decline and fall. And to Otto the Great belongs the glory of permanently resuscitating a uniform imperial system in Europe. Indeed Mr. Bryce says, that 'the Holy Roman Empire is the creation' of Otto. How then are we to designate the labours of Charlemagne? In 924 died Berengar of Friuli, the Lombard, and probably the first to bear the title of King of Italy. Berengar II. sought to force the beautiful and royal widow Adelheid to marry him. From her prison she appealed to the German king, nor appealed in vain. He rescued her, and he married her, and with her he was crowned at Rome by John XII. A.D. 962. If we hesitate to adopt Mr. Bryce's expression as to the connexion between Otto and the empire, and to regard him as the founder of what was already founded, he commends our unqualified assent in the following:—

'It is on the religious life that nations repose. Because divinity was divided, humanity had been divided likewise; the doctrine of the unity of God now enforced the unity of man, who had been created in His image. The first lesson of Christianity was love; a love that was to join in one body those whom suspicion, and prejudice, and pride of race had hitherto kept apart. There was thus formed by the new religion a community of the faithful, a Holy Empire designed to gather all men into its bosom, and standing opposed to the manifold polytheisms of the older world, exactly as the universal sway of the Cæsars was contrasted with the innumerable kingdoms and republics that had gone before it. The analogy of the two made them appear parts of one great world-movement toward unity; the coincidence of their boundaries, which had begun before Constantine, lasted long enough after him to associate them indissolubly together.'—P. 100.

But we are at a loss to know how such a movement towards unity could take effect without expressing itself in a concrete form: or how the felt necessity of a visible Church characterizes the middle more than the preceding ages. It is a truism, and a tedious one, to tell us that the whole fabric of the mediæval Christianity rested upon the idea of the Visible Church. He goes on:—

‘To acquiesce in the establishment of National Churches would have appeared to those men, as it must always appear when scrutinized, contradictory to the nature of a religious body, opposed to the genius of Christianity, defensible, when capable of defence at all, only as a temporary resource in the midst of insuperable difficulties. Had this plan, on which so many have dwelt with complacency in later times, been proposed either to the primitive Church in its adversity, or to the dominant Church of the ninth century, it would have been rejected with horror; but, since there were as yet no nations, the plan was one which did not, and could not present itself.’ —P. 103.

We are quite sure that our extract is honestly and accurately made. We can scarcely understand the statement that there were as yet *no nations*; and we confess to being wholly bewildered by the way in which Mr. Bryce speaks of ‘National Churches.’ If indeed in this, as only too plainly in other parts of his book, his ideas are imported from the other side of the Tweed, then indeed we dare affirm with him that an ecclesiastical system so anarthrous and acephalous as that patented by John Knox, that devout accomplice in three murders, would have puzzled the Church at any period of its undivided being, whether dominant or depressed. If Mr. Bryce means that there were in the Church no features distinguishable according to the nation in which it existed, by the recognition of which the existence of national Churches was recognised, he had better read again the canons of the Council of Nicæa. If it be that he is pleading for an Ultramontane unity, and maintaining that there existed, at any time during the acknowledged existence of the Holy Roman Empire, any real acceptance of such unity on the part of the Church as a whole, or of the Western Church—it is immaterial which,—then we must submit that he is wonderfully indifferent to the ecclesiastical history of the middle age. If he only means that the early Church, which was aghast at the schisms of the Gnostic, Arian, and Donatistic epochs, would have been shocked at our modern inveterate schisms, then he is stating a very bare truism; and, it must be added, that he is singularly and peculiarly unhappy in his mode of stating it. In the following passage Mr. Bryce is more happy; and he gives us a valuable illustration of an important truth:—

‘Like the unity of the Church, the doctrine of a universal monarchy had a theoretical as well as an historical basis, and may be traced up to



those metaphysical ideas out of which the system we call Realism developed itself. In this view Humanity is an essential quality present in all men, and making them what they are : as regards it they are therefore not many but one, the differences between individuals being no more than accidents. The whole truth of their being lies in the universal property, which alone has a permanent and independent existence. The common nature of the individuals thus gathered into one being is typified in its two aspects, the spiritual and the secular, by two persons, the World-Priest and the World-Monarch, who present on earth a similitude of the Divine Unity.' [How two persons and their offices—never one, and almost never at one, but bitterly contradictory—can be said to present a 'similitude of a unity,' or even the similitude of a similitude of unity, divine or otherwise, we are at a loss to conceive.] 'That the souls of all Christian men should be guided by one hierarchy, rising through successive grades to a supreme head, while for their deeds they were answerable to a multitude of local, unconnected, mutually irresponsible potentates, appeared to them necessarily opposed to the Divine order. As they could not imagine, nor value if they had imagined, a communion of the saints, without its expression in a visible Church, so in matters temporal they recognised no brotherhood of spirit without the bonds of form, no universal humanity save in the image of a universal state.'—P. 105.

Engelbert, Mr. Bryce's authority for this view, grounds his theory on S. Augustine; so that, whatever be the theory of S. Augustine, it is not likely to have been based upon the 'parallel unities' of Church and Empire. The true issue of the principles of Engelbert were identical with the aspirations of Maximilian, viz. the unification of the world-monarchy and world-priesthood. And, in point of fact, the idea of Maximilian had been at an early period anticipated by the Bishop of Rome. S. Leo the Great had already conceptions and visions of the superlocal dominion of the apostolic chair. According to the terms of the Donation of Constantine, the pope was to inhabit the Lateran, to wear the diadem, the collar, the purple cloak, to carry the sceptre, and to be attended by a body of chamberlains. Similarly his clergy were to ride on white horses, and enjoy all the privileges of senators and patricians. It would seem indeed as if the Roman Church had called into being the imperial power in order that it might more advantageously learn how to affect the imperial style, and grow into the imitation of temporal dominion. The canon law was intended to reproduce and rival the imperial jurisdiction; and the first to codify it, Gregory IX., was styled the Justinian of the Church. So long indeed as the chief of the Church of Rome abstained from advancing his exclusive claims to the world-monarchy, the clergy cherished the imperial organization renewed under Otto the Great. The progress to the Hildebrandine assumptions was broken by the formal recognition of God as the *Imperator Cælestis*. Under the great politic pope this recognition would have been studiously avoided. The

image employed by mediæval writers sufficiently illustrates the prevailing doctrine. As the soul and the body are the papal and imperial power. Thus :—

‘The Holy Roman Church and the Holy Roman Empire are one and the same thing, in a mystic dualism which corresponds to the two natures of its Founder.’

This was the idol of the Forum, to which nearly ten centuries of Christendom did unquestioning homage : which even Hooker, under the shelter of an ‘if,’ and undismayed by existing facts, upheld :—

If all that believe be contained in the name of the Church, how should the Church remain by personal subsistence divided from the commonweal, when the whole commonweal doth believe? The Church and the commonweal are in this case therefore personally one society, which society being termed a commonweal as it liveth under whatsoever form of secular law and regimen, a Church as it liveth under the spiritual law of Christ, forasmuch as these two laws contain so many and different offices, there must of necessity be appointed in it some to one charge, and some to another, yet without dividing the whole, or making it two several impaled societies.’—*Ecc. Pol.* viii.

Only in the case of the Holy Roman Empire the two societies were, after a few years’ concord, engaged in *impaling* one another in a somewhat different use of the term. At the outset it was held that the divine commission was issued by the Almighty, as Sovereign of the earth, directly to the Emperor. Yet in fact this recognition of mutual independence was only attained at three points of the imperial history, and in all cases under emperors who had the courage to expound and maintain the actual practice of the imperial predominance. When the power of the crown was depressed, then that of the mitre asserted itself, and Boniface VIII. is entitled to the credit of being the first to assert what all along must have been foreseen by every thoughtful observer would be asserted at last, the actual identity of the imperial crown and the Roman mitre. The effect of this was in brief to render to all appearance irremediable the existing divisions in the Church. As we have already advanced, the conception of the Holy Roman Empire took its beginning in the iconoclastic controversy ; and it was not the Bishop of Rome’s fault that the immediate effect of the division of the empire was not the perpetuation of a schism from the beginning. It is with a melancholy interest we read the reiterated statements of Frederick I. : that as there is in heaven but one God, so there is here but one pope, and one emperor—that Divine Providence has specially advanced the Holy Roman Empire to obviate the continuance of schism in the Church. The history of the popedom down to the remorseful death-bed

of the last prince-pope, Nicholas V., not to pass on to later times, is but one consistent and continuous narrative, proving how the position of the Western patriarch made it at once his necessity and his interest, *as at this day*, to resist and to reject all projects of spiritual reunion. In the case of both pope and emperor, their respective positions were so delicate and undefined that perhaps they could not help indulging in the most extravagant vaunts, and dreams the most irrational. The empire did not heal the schism to which it succeeded, and it shrivelled up and subsided into entire incapacity in face of the schism which overtook it in the sixteenth century. Indeed, its history may be looked on as typified in the power, energy, and premature impotence of Charles V., the last genuine head of the Lower Empire. The harmony between the Church and Empire was great at the beginning, for the obvious reason of mutual defence; the secular power needed the spiritual sanctions of the Church, the Church needed to be backed up by the temporal force of the new order. The most remarkable reversal of the original order of precedence between the two powers is to be found in the privilege of convening General Councils: a right, as Mr. Bryce says, of vast importance, even when exercised concurrently with the pope; but of course far more important when the object of the Council was 'to settle a disputed election, or, as at Constance, to depose the reigning pontiff 'himself.'<sup>1</sup> Indeed the fact of possessing the right of calling General Councils points to the other spiritual functions of the emperor. The order of coronation was virtually also an order of consecration to a spiritual position. Beside the globe, crown, and sceptre, the emperor received the ring of faith, was ordained a subdeacon, assisted the pope in celebrating mass, partook, not 'as a clerical person,' as Mr. Bryce says, but as co-celebrant, of the Eucharist in both kinds; and was admitted a canon of S. Peter and S. John Lateran.

Holy Scripture itself was pressed into furnishing additional sanctions to the divine right of the prince thus consecrated. The old theory of Jerome and Origen held that the Roman Empire, the fourth of Daniel's vision, the fourth part of Nebuchadnezzar's image, was to be the world's last universal kingdom, to which Antichrist was to succeed. For, according to the statement of Aquinas, as Christ came under the universal sway of Rome, so Antichrist will come under the general departure from that

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Bryce understands the 'commandment and will of Princes,' in our Twenty-first Article, to mean '*principum Romanorum*.' The singular coincidence of the two Nicene Councils being presided over by princes who were both stained with the blood of their sons is noticed by Gibbon. But Charlemagne was virtually *Princeps Romanus* when the decrees of the Seventh Council were sent to him.

empire as politically and spiritually regarded. Mr. Bryce would fain pass on from the theologians to the poets and artists of the Middle Ages, and seek in them an illustration of the views he is propounding; but he shrinks from the task, in modest diffidence as to his powers of pursuing it. In the domain of art, however, he instances two works in which the theory of the mediæval empire is unmistakeably set forth—one of them in Rome, the other in Florence.

The mosaic of the Lateran Triclinium is a memorial of the times of Charlemagne, and was constructed by Pope Leo III.; and an exact copy of it, made by Sixtus V., may still be seen over against the façade of S. John Lateran. As this work of ecclesiastical art forms a valuable corrective of Ultramontane ideas, we shall extract Mr. Bryce's description of it:—

'It represents in the centre Christ surrounded by the Apostles, whom He is sending forth to preach the Gospel; one hand is extended to bless, the other holds a book with the words "*Pax Vobis.*" Below, and to the right, Christ is depicted again, and this time sitting: on His right hand kneels Pope Sylvester, on His left the Emperor Constantine; to the one He gives the keys of heaven and hell, to the other a banner, surmounted by a cross. In the group on the opposite, that is, on the left, side of the arch, we see the Apostle Peter seated, before whom in like manner kneel Pope Leo III. and Charles the Emperor; the latter wearing, like Constantine, his crown; Peter, himself grasping the keys, gives to Leo the pallium of an archbishop, to Charles the banner of the Christian army. The order and nature of the ideas here symbolised is sufficiently clear. First comes the revelation of the Gospel, and the Divine commission to gather all men into its fold. Next the institution, at the memorable era of Constantine's conversion, of the two powers by which the Christian people is to be respectively taught and governed. Thirdly, we are shown the permanent vicar of God, the Apostle who keeps the keys of heaven and hell, re-establishing these same powers on a new and firmer basis.'—P. 127.

The Florentine fresco in the Dominican convent of Santa Maria Novella belongs to about the date of 1350 A.D. In this painting the Pope and Emperor are represented as seated side by side; and just over the place where these appear the Saviour is enthroned amid saints and angels.

Theoretically, the tendency of the imperial system was to denationalize the several subordinate kingdoms. The emperor was not an hereditary chief, but the elect of his supporters; and the post he occupied was independent of the race or rank or actual resources of him who filled it. He not only excelled in dignity, but his power was different from that of the kings of the earth. This distinction between the imperial and kingly dignity was lost to sight under Charlemagne; but the difference became evident in his successors, and took its legitimate shape of an undefined suzerainty.

'It was characteristic of the Middle Ages, that, demanding the existence of an emperor, they were careless who he was or how he was chosen, so he had been duly inaugurated; and that they were not shocked by the contrast between unbounded rights and actual helplessness. At no time in the world's history has theory, pretending all the while to control practice, been so utterly divorced from it. Ferocious and sensual, that age worshipped humility and asceticism; there has never been a purer ideal of love nor a grosser profligacy of life.'—P. 131.

The Lower Empire had not yet become international, which was its main characteristic in comparatively modern times. It had not become international for a very obvious reason in Mr. Bryce's judgment,—there scarcely yet had arisen the distinction of nations. There was a going to and fro on the public stage of races; there were human currents which had not yet become inspissated and broken up into kingdoms. At the close of the tenth century the emperor was also a German. 'This union in one person of two characters—a union at first personal, then official, and which became at last a fusion of the two into something different from either—is the key to the whole subsequent history of Germany and the empire.'

Feudalism, which had taken its rise on Roman soil, and was most fully established in France, existed in a mitigated form in Germany. Here the king, though titular lord of the soil, and empowered to exact aid and service from his vassals, and to make war and peace, was at the same time under great restraints. He could not retain escheated fiefs, a privilege which was the very basis of the power of the crown in France: he could not meddle with the jurisdiction of his tenants in their own lands, nor prevent them making leagues or waging war with one another. The great lords were the three Rhenish archbishops, whose power Otto seriously encroached upon by the institution of the Counts Palatine, whom he invested with '*regalia jura*' within their own districts. Their power became more depressed and obscured on the rise of the second order of nobility in the thirteenth century. Before the gradual and indeed inevitable intrusion of Roman orders the primitive institutions of Germany disappeared; the class of serfs increased; the army of the nation dwindled down into a cavalry militia of barons and their followers, bound to a short and unwillingly rendered service. The popular assemblies were never summoned; and, instead of the old unity of national life, every district now had its own rules and customs administered by the court of the local lord. The nation had thus entered upon a new condition of being, in which, perhaps, after the lapse of centuries it might have achieved results akin to those of England, when its destiny was marred by the investiture of the German king with the dignity of the imperial purple.

'No two systems can be more unlike than those whose headship became thus vested in one person: the one centralized, the other local; the one resting on a sublime theory, the other the rude offspring of anarchy; the one gathering all power into the hands of an irresponsible monarch, the other limiting his rights, and authorizing resistance to his commands; the one demanding the equality of all citizens, the other bound up with an aristocracy the proudest, and in its gradations of rank the most exact, that Europe has ever seen. Characters so repugnant could not, it might be thought, meet in one person, or, if they met, must strive till one swallowed up the other. It was not so. In the fusion which began from the first, though it was for a time imperceptible, each of the two characters gave and each lost some of its attributes; the king became more than German, the emperor less than Roman,—till, at the end of six centuries, the monarch in whom two "persons" had been united appeared as a third, different from either of the former, and might not inappropriately be entitled "German Emperor." It was natural that the great mass of Otto's subjects, to whom the imperial title, dimly associated with Rome and the Pope, sounded grander than the regal, without being known as otherwise different, should in thought and speech confound them. The sovereign and his ecclesiastical advisers, with far clearer views of the new office and of the mutual relations of the two, found it impossible to separate them in practice, and were glad to merge the lesser in the greater. For, as lord of the world, Otto was emperor north as well as south of the Alps. When he issued an edict, he claimed the obedience of his Teutonic subjects in both capacities; when, as emperor, he led the armies of the Gospel against the heathen, it was the standard of their feudal superior that his armed vassals followed; when he founded churches and appointed bishops, he acted partly as suzerain of feudal lands, partly as protector of the faith, charged to guide the Church in matters temporal. Thus the assumption of the imperial crown brought to Otto as its first result an apparent increase of domestic peace; it made his position by its historical associations more dignified, by its religious more hallowed; it raised him higher above his vassals, and above other sovereigns; it enlarged his prerogative in ecclesiastical affairs; and, by necessary consequence, gave to ecclesiastics a more important place at court and in the administration of government than they had enjoyed before. In the eleventh century a full half of the land and wealth of the country, and no small part of its military strength, was in the hands of Churchmen; their influence predominated in the Diet: the arch-chancellorship of the empire, highest of all offices, belonged of right to the Archbishop of Mentz, as primate of Germany. It was by Otto, who in resuming the attitude must repeat the policy of Charles, that the greatness of the clergy was thus advanced. He is commonly said to have wished to weaken the aristocracy by raising up rivals to them in the hierarchy. It may have been so, and the measure was at any rate a disastrous one; for the clergy soon approved themselves not less rebellious than those whom they were to restrain. But, in accusing Otto's judgment, historians have often forgotten in what position he stood to the Church, and how it behoved him, according to the doctrine received, to establish an order like in all things to that which he found already subsisting in the State.'—P. 140.

On the other hand, the barons were suspicious and watchful that, under the fusion of the several functions, they should not be betrayed into abandoning any part of what they held to be their inalienable rights. Whatever Otto might demand as emperor, he only received as king; and the result of all this



was that in Germany the imperial office was feudalized, while Germany itself was Romanized:—

‘Nevertheless, even while they seemed to blend, there remained between the genius of imperialism (if we may use a now perverted word) and that of feudalism a deep and lasting hostility. It was Otto who made the Germans, hitherto an aggregate of tribes, a single people; and welding them into a strong political body, taught them to rise through its collective greatness to the consciousness of national life, never thenceforth to be extinguished.’

The feudal system had nearly extinguished the old Teutonic order of freemen; and Otto was thus not in a position to avail himself of the only true counterweights to a predominant and encroaching aristocracy. The burgher class began to take form after Henry the Fowler induced his forest-loving people to dwell in fortresses to resist the inroads of the Hungarians; and it was the very tendency of the imperial name to foster—as the kingly was debarred from doing—the influences, and invite the sympathy, of the Commons.

Mr. Bryce devotes a chapter to a review of the Saxon and Franconian emperors. Otto the Great perhaps attained the highest position of personal power of all the emperors: his courageous conduct in the successful deposition of John XII. (Rome has been rather unfortunate in her Johns, the last of which name, generally known among his contemporaries as the ‘*Diabolus Incarnatus*,’ was deposed by the last real emperor of the Lower Empire) and the elevation to the vacant throne of Leo the secretary, illustrates this. John, it is true, succeeded in returning to the city, and availing himself of a tumult among the Romans, who were impatient of the presence of the imperial troops in the city; but he was speedily put out of the way by the sword of an injured husband, and Otto not only carried his nominee against the mob, but extorted from the citizens an absolute veto on all papal elections. But even the authority of Otto could not be maintained in the city, and, the moment his back was turned, Rome reasserted her turbulent independence. Even in Italy, where he ruled legitimately as Italian king, he found his vassals less submissive than in Germany. He was in a position, however, to renew two plans of Charlemagne—that of external conquest and of imperial reconstruction; and he effected an apparent reconciliation between the East and West by procuring as a bride, for his successor, Theophano, the daughter of Romanus II. the emperor. The sister of this Theophano married the Russian duke Wolodomir, whose granddaughter, by her marriage with Henry I. of France, connected the imperial line of Byzantium with the West.

In that West the power of the emperor was materially

crippled. The rise of the house of Capet marks the date of the emancipation of the Romano-Keltic people from the claims of the empire, which were never after admitted. In compensation for this loss Lorraine and Burgundy became, the one an integral part of the empire, the other a dependency. Schleswig, and the Slavic tribes, and the Hungarians—which last Otto in effect made an European nation—owned the power of his arms. In Spain Otto made no way. And in England, although Henry the Fowler had obtained for Otto the hand of Edith the daughter of Athelstan, all claim of supremacy was stoutly and stubbornly repudiated by Edgar. The empire as it thus stood in the Saxon line included really only Germany proper and two-thirds of Italy, and it was thus less wide than the empire of Charles; and the ecclesiastical element was not so predominant. It was also—one might say therefore—less Roman. It was probably owing to these altered relations as much as to the genius of Otto that the empire enjoyed more peace and prosperity. Germany became the teacher of the nations, and Poland and Bohemia ‘recovered from her their arts and their learning with their religion.’

‘If the revived Romano-Germanic Empire was less splendid than the Western Empire had been under Charles, it was, within narrower limits, firmer and more lasting, since based on a social force which the other had wanted. It perpetuated the name, the language, the literature—such as it then was—of Rome; it extended her spiritual sway; it strove to represent that concentration for which men cried, and became a power to unite and civilize Europe.’—P. 159.

The succeeding rulers were not men of much mark, with the exception of the son of that Theophano, the Byzantine princess whom we have mentioned above. Otto III. was the most deserving of note of all the after emperors. His story is ‘short, sad, full of bright promise never fulfilled.’ It was his design to abandon, at least for the present, the less civilized countries of the north, to erect his throne in Italy, and revive the institutions of the Roman monarchy. Rome was to become again the capital of an empire victorious as Trajan’s, despotic as Justinian’s, holy as Constantine’s. He took the reins of government from his mother’s hand when he was only sixteen, and his first task was to pacify and subdue the turbulence of Rome. He asserted his right over the Papal chair so far as to appoint Gregory V. and the celebrated Sylvester II.: with those appointments, in room of the profligate priests of Italy, ‘began the Teutonic reform of the papacy, which raised it from the abyss of the tenth century to the point where Hildebrand found it.’ But by reforming the Church, the Emperor was promoting the disintegration of the empire—

‘With his tutor in Peter’s chair to second or direct him, Otto laboured on his great project in a spirit almost mystic. He had an intense religious belief in the emperor’s duties to the world. To exclude the claims of the Greeks he used the title “*Romanorum Imperator*,” instead of the simple “*Imperator*” of his predecessors. He introduced into the simple German court the ceremonious magnificence of Byzantium, not without giving offence to many of his followers. His father’s wish, to draw Italy and Germany more closely together, he followed up by giving the chancellorship of both countries to the same Churchman, by maintaining a strong force of Germans in Italy, and by taking his Italian retinue with him through the Transalpine lands. How far these brilliant and far-reaching plans were capable of realization had their author lived to attempt it, can be but guessed at. It is reasonable to suppose that whatever power he might have gained in the south he would have lost in the north. Dwelling rarely in Germany, and in mind more a Greek than a Teuton, he reined in the fierce barons with no such tight hand as his grandfather had been wont to do; he neglected the schemes of northern conquest; he released the Polish dukes from the obligation of tribute. But all, save that those plans were his, is now no more than a conjecture, for Otto III. “the wonder of the world,” as his own generation called him, died childless on the threshold of manhood, the victim, if we may trust a story of the time, of the revenge of Stephanina, widow of Crescentius, who ensnared him by her beauty, and slew him by a lingering poison. They carried him across the Alps with laments, whose echoes sound faintly yet from the pages of monkish chroniclers, and buried him in the choir of the basilica at Aachen, some twenty paces from the tomb of Charles beneath the central dome. Two years had not passed since, setting out on his last journey to Rome, he had opened that tomb; had gazed on the great emperor, sitting on a marble throne, robed and crowned, with the Gospel-book open before him; and then, touching the dead hand, unclasping from the neck its golden cross, had taken, as it were, investiture of the empire from his Frankish forerunner. Short as was his life and few his acts, Otto III. is in one respect more memorable than any who went before or came after him. None save he desired to make the seven-hilled city again the seat of dominion, reducing Germany, and Lombardy, and Greece, to their rightful place of subject provinces. No one else so forgot the present to live in the light of the ancient order; no other soul was so possessed by that fervid mysticism and that reverence for the glories of the past, whereon rested the idea of the mediæval empire.’—Pp. 161—163.

The death of Otto marks the period when the empire began to show signs of weakness, although on the accession of Conrad, the first monarch of the Franconian line, Burgundy and Arles were added to the Germanic realm. Indeed in such a precarious state was the empire even now, that Rome, instead of being the centre, was but an outpost, contiguous to the Greek possessions, Bari and Beneventum, and liable at any moment to become again subject to the Byzantine ruler. Conrad’s son, Henry III., raised the empire to the meridian of its power. No one’s prerogative had stood so high. At home and abroad the strength of the imperial will was recognised; in Rome he was more absolute than any German prince before or since. He deposed the three claimants of the Papal chair, whose contest

had 'shocked even the reckless apathy of Italy,' and the Synod passed a decree granting to Henry the right of nominating the Supreme Pontiff. On his sudden decease in 1056, the sceptre dropped into the hands of a child, and the great struggle began between the empire and the papacy, the latter led on by the Archdeacon Hildebrand.

As we have already seen, the Germano-Roman empire owed its origin to the Roman Church's carnal desire of secular protection: a desire so strong as to blind the chief actors to the hereditary rights of the imperial purple, and to make them forgetful of their duties to 'God and the King.' Then followed an incident the most discreditable to the Church of all that had befallen her since the triumph of Arianism, indeed, the duties and professions of the Church considered, the most infamous which could have occurred, the forgery of the donation of Constantine. A fact was converted into a type; and the type in turn was made to do service as a fact. Constantine's translation of his court to Byzantium implied the removal from the Church of all secular restraints upon her power of self-multiplication, and then it was argued that thus the emperor had conferred temporal possessions and royal dignity upon the Bishop of Rome. If the bishop had been in Rome then as prominent and responsible a person as he became eight or nine centuries afterwards, the whole case would be simpler. Yet we hold that the forgeries had a groundwork deeper and broader than Mr. Bryce admits. He argues that Constantine virtually invested the pope with authority, because the pope was the chief person in the forsaken capital. We believe that this is wholly a mistake; nor can we conceive how the leader of an obscure, unpopular, and hitherto unacknowledged community could have achieved, so soon as the year 321, or in many years after, the eminent position which is assumed. The deeper and broader groundwork for the forgeries which we spoke of above is found in the restoration, by order of Constantine, of the property confiscated under Diocletian, and the permission secured to the Church by the same emperor to receive bequests. The Church must, in the nature of things, have acquired property more or less. The Church of Rome was in possession of landed property at the beginning of the fourth century; and there can be no difficulty in supposing that Constantine (as stated in the life of S. Sylvester) of his own gift may have himself invested the Roman Church with some of these possessions, proving himself thus in a double way, by restoration and endowment, a generous patron to the Church. The forgeries, after doing irreparable mischief, are owned to be forgeries. The only question is as to when and by whom they were made. The theory of Baronius, mentioned by Gibbon

in a note, was cleverly forged to cast the odium of the crime on the Greeks. But the Greeks were certainly not the forgers: the Latin Church had been utilizing the document for three centuries before it became known to the Greeks. On the other hand, it is capable of proof that the theory of Morinus, placing it in the tenth century, is too late. But we shall be safe in accounting the document as the production of the middle of the ninth century: and the sovereignty which it conferred we see publicly assumed by Nicolas I. the first pontiff who was crowned; and this would place its birth close to that of the Decretals. So formidable an argument was but rarely employed. It was brought forth just as the imperial power was becoming weaker, and less disposed to contend about what seemed only abstract rights. Leo IV. in 1054, urged it against the Patriarch of Constantinople to justify his claims: Urban II. in 1091, employed it to make good his claim over Corsica. We in this country are not likely to forget the use made of it against us: when first it was assumed that all the islands of the West were included in the original donation: and then, acting on the assumption, Hadrian IV. bestowed Ireland on the English king. How this rare use can be reconciled with the pretensions of Rome we cannot conceive, and we have not room for any speculations upon this suggestive topic; but it is gratifying to be able to put on record the fact that the first open denial of the authenticity of the document was made in the Roman Church. We say, open denial; for the fact that Gregory VII. never availed himself of so appropriate an instrument in vindicating his claims seems to indicate that that singularly sagacious and clear-headed prelate was himself unconvinced of its authenticity. But the world accepted it: and the first denial of the truth and validity of the donation of Constantine arose out of a question connected with a private lawsuit, and proceeded from a Sabine monastery, so late as the year 1105.<sup>1</sup> The monks of the Benedictine Abbey of Farfa ventured to maintain that the jurisdiction of the Holy See was exclusively spiritual. Nothing came of this. The tendency of such a claim as that which the donation put forward is to extend itself. And in a very little time the empire came to be regarded as the gift of the pope. And yet that not as pope: there was as yet no affectation of that transcendental theory that all power was Peter's in heaven and in earth, as asserted by such pontiffs of the thirteenth centuries as Innocent III., Gregory IX., and Innocent IV. The earlier and more reasonable theory was that in accordance with which the pope, representing and acting on behalf of the Roman

---

<sup>1</sup> Gibbon, c. 49.

people, the hereditary trustees of the imperial power, conferred the crown on Charlemagne and his successors. Yet it would be rash and unhistorical to make the forged donation responsible for the secular aims and efforts of the Bishop of Rome. Rather, the production of the document witnessed to the existence of these aspirations; which indeed would seem to have been inevitable considering the connexion existing between the imperial and ecclesiastical thrones. If the pontiff was to bestow upon an orthodox and faithful king the *Imperium Romanorum*, he surely must have the right to withhold or to retract this supreme dower in cases where the elect of the German powers was neither right in belief nor exemplary in practice, as was the case with Frederick II. If the pontiff had thus impliedly the power of conferring, of withholding, of retracting, the imperial crown, by the very circumstances of the case it became an inevitable conclusion that the totality of the imperial power, to bestow or to refuse, rested in the pontiff: according to the original conception of the Germano-Roman empire. The forgeries were only a clumsy attempt at *ex post facto* legislation, in which it was tried to give an historical and logical connexion to the pontifical claims. The forgeries did not create the papal claims, they witnessed to them. Already some centuries earlier Leo the Great had affirmed the ecclesiastical dignity of the city. '*Roma per sedem Beati Petri caput orbis effecta.*' And Gregory the Great did more than any other in the assertion of such a claim. It was an easy task, after the principle of coronation at Rome by the Pope's hands was admitted and acted on, to convert this into a recognition of ulterior pretensions; or to prepare the way for the assumption that the papal chair was itself the source of the imperial dignity. Louis the Pious, by submitting to be crowned afresh, owned the invalidity of any coronation not performed by the Bishop of Rome. The whole tenor of the Hildebrandian reforms seemed designed to weaken on the other hand the imperial powers. The appointment of a regular body to choose the wearer of the tiara was an immense advance to the way of extinguishing the influence of the emperor. Again: all estates were interested in putting down the sin of simony; but, when Gregory VII. made it a sin for a cleric to receive a benefice from a layman, he denounced the whole system of lay investiture, and struck a 'deadly blow at all secular authority. Half of 'the land and wealth of Germany was in the hands of bishops 'and abbots, who would now be freed from the monarch's control 'to pass under that of the pope.' Then the conflict between the as yet uncrowned Henry IV. and Gregory VII. resulted in such entire victory to the pontifical side as to carry to its greatest height the authority of the Bishop of Rome, and it



could no more be questioned that the spiritual dominion was absolutely superior, and that all rulers were responsible to it.

'Gregory was not the inventor nor the first propounder of these doctrines: they had been long before a part of mediæval Christianity, interwoven with its most vital doctrines. But he was the first who dared to apply them to the world as he found it. His was that rarest and grandest of gifts, an intellectual courage and power of imaginative belief, [?] which, when it has convinced itself of aught, accepts it fully with all its consequences, and shrinks not from acting at once upon it. A perilous gift, as the melancholy end of his own career proved, for men were found less ready than he had thought them to follow out with unswerving consistency like his the principles which all acknowledged. But it was the very suddenness and boldness of his policy that secured the ultimate triumph of his cause,—arousing men's minds, and making that seem realized which had been till then a vague theory. His premisses were admitted—and no one dreamt of denying them—the reasonings by which he established the superiority of spiritual to temporal jurisdiction were unassailable. With his authority in whose hands are the keys of heaven and hell, whose word can bestow eternal bliss or plunge in everlasting misery, no other earthly authority can compete or interfere: if his power extends into the infinite, how much more must he be supreme over things finite? It was thus that Gregory and his successors were wont to argue; the wonder is not that they were obeyed, but that they were not obeyed more implicitly.'—P. 177.

An unexpected help towards the enforcement of these pretensions was found in the component parts of the empire itself. Whatever estates, forming the imperial constitution, were bent on gaining anything from the crown, had always the pope as an ally, actual or possible. And so the Italian states gained the papal sanction for their leagues. The German states, again, were thus enabled, not only in general to narrow the prerogatives of their head, but also to exact the promise that the crown should not become hereditary:—

'It is not possible here to dwell on the details of this struggle, rich as it is in the interest of adventure and character, momentous as were its results for the future. A word or two must suffice to describe the conclusion, not indeed of the whole drama, which was to extend over centuries, but of what may be called its first act. Even that act lasted beyond the lives of the original performers. Gregory VII. passed away at Salerno in A.D. 1087, exclaiming with his last breath, "I have loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile:" twenty years later, in A.D. 1106, Henry IV. died, dethroned by an unnatural son whom the hatred of a relentless pontiff [Paschal II.] had raised in rebellion against him. But that son, the Emperor Henry V., so far from conceding the point in dispute, proved an antagonist more ruthless, and not less able, than his father. He claimed for his crown all the rights over ecclesiastics that his predecessors had ever enjoyed, and when at his coronation at Rome, A.D. 1112, Pope Paschal II. refused to complete the rite until he should have yielded, Henry seized both pope and cardinals, and compelled them by a rigorous imprisonment to consent to a treaty which he dictated. Once set free the Pope, as was natural, disavowed his extorted concession, and the struggle was protracted for ten years longer, until nearly half a century had elapsed

from the first quarrel between Gregory VII. and Henry IV. The Concordat of Worms, concluded in A.D. 1122, was in form a compromise designed to spare either party the humiliation of defeat. Yet the Papacy remained master of the field. The emperor retained perforce half of those rights of investiture which had formerly been his. He could never resume the position of Henry III. ; his wishes or intrigues might influence the proceedings of a chapter, his oath bound him from open interference. He had entered the strife in the fulness of dignity ; he came out of it with tarnished glory and shattered power. His wars had been hitherto carried on with foreign foes, or at most with a single rebel noble ; now his steadiest ally was turned into his fiercest assailant, and had enlisted against him half his court, half the magnates of his realm. At any moment his sceptre might be shivered in his hand by the bolt of anathema, and a host of enemies spring up from every convent and cathedral.' —P. 180.

This damaging conflict had reached its height at a moment full of the most critical interest for both parties ; when a spirit of earnest and dutiful co-operation was, above all things, necessary. The era of the Crusades had set in. It of right belonged to the head of the Holy Empire to lead against the infidel the sacramental host of the warriors of the Church. This was his special function. It might too have proved an opportunity of winning back lost prestige and influence. As it was, all the benefits were reaped by Europe and the pope. By a defecating process which cleared her of a great deal of perilous stuff, Europe regained a sense of security, and found a season of repose, during which she was able to pursue undisturbed a course of much-needed internal re-organization. But the pope derived a like kind of benefit from the Crusades to that which his predecessors had derived from the translation of the seat of empire from the old capital to the new Rome on the Bosphorus. His dignity and right of precedence were left undisputed, and the power was everywhere regarded with reverence and awe which could call all Europe to arms. It is lamentable to think that the only *Catholic* work accomplished by the mediæval popes, of whom history and Dr. Newman have expressed such very irreconcilable opinions, was the enlistment of the nations in a work of fruitless bloodshed—a successful enlistment, from which, a century and a half later, a subsequent pope learned how to raise a crusade against the emperor himself. But the prosperous issue of the papal struggle was marred by one consequence. The seeds of disunion were sown between the component elements of the Germano-Roman empire. The defeat of the empire in her struggles with the pope bred in Germany that profound national distrust and hatred which was ripe for action whenever Luther should come. By raising the priesthood, in order to depress the nobles, Otto the Great prepared the way for the overthrow of his own power. Through a similar fatal

policy, the popes, encroaching upon the freedom of the German states, called into being and gave force to that feeling of Teutonic patriotism, the test of which was resistance to Italian priestcraft. But in this period of anarchy, some changes indirectly repressive of the papal power were brought about; especially the elective principle was recognised, A.D. 1156; and if by fiefs becoming hereditary, or being bestowed with the consent of the state, the power of the crown seemed narrowed, yet at the outset this change was of a conservative character; its final effect was to change the array of battle; and thenceforward it is not so much emperor and pope who are pitted against one another, as the Germanic and Italian nationalities themselves.

On the failure of the Franconian line, the hapless house of Hohenstauffen, with its strong anti-papal antipathies, succeeded, and held the uneasy throne for nearly a century, from Conrad III. 1138. Barbarossa, his successor, carried the dignity and power of the empire to its climax. Mr. Bryce describes him happily as a kind of Imperialist Hildebrand. It is not the least curious fact in all this eventful history, that whenever such a prince appeared, Rome was ready with her match, and Barbarossa found himself pitted against Hadrian IV. and Alexander III. The already existing causes of dispute inherent in their respective positions were inflamed by the claim of the pope to the bequest of the Countess Matilda, of Tuscany; while, as feudal superior of the Norman kings of Naples and Sicily, as protector of the towns and barons of North Italy, who feared the Germanic yoke, the pontiff appeared very much as an independent potentate. The disputes between Hadrian and Frederick were soon closed by the death of the former; but then succeeds that dismal twenty years' strife, in which the emperor was contending, as our Henry II. was contemporaneously contending, to recover the command of the priesthood, and establish the political supremacy of the crown. The inter-leagued cities of Lombardy, whose confederacy had been counselled and hallowed by the pontiff, and the fivers of Rome secured to Alexander III. a victory the more signal, as it was over a monarch so astute and devoted. Three slabs of red marble in S. Mark's, at Venice, indicate the issue of the conflict. They mark the spot where Frederick, overcome with sudden awe, knelt, and was raised by the pope with tears of joy, and with the kiss of peace. The tendency of the revival, which set in about this time, in the study of civil law, was to reinstate, in theory at least, the emperor in his imperilled dignities, and gave a kind of sanction to the dreamy aspirations of Arnold of Brescia. Had Conrad III. listened to the overtures of this remarkable man, instead of the solemn and pathetic voice of the Abbot of Clairvaux, Europe might never

have been blessed or banned by one assuming to be universal bishop, and sole fount of all episcopal authority. With a different feeling, and in a more reprehensible tone, Frederick made answer to the Roman deputation, which would have bestowed on him universal empire, as the Romans might have bestowed it on Julius at the Lupercalia. He treated the whole proposal with unhesitating insolence; and unvarying success in war and diplomacy seemed to attend all his efforts on Italian ground, to vindicate the inalienable rights of the crown.

'This fair sky was soon clouded. From her quenchless ashes uprose Milan; Cremona, scorning old jealousies, helped to rebuild what she had destroyed; and the confederates, committed to an almost hopeless strife, clung faithfully together till, on the field of Legnano, the empire's banner went down before the carroccio of the free city. Frederick, though harsh in war, and now balked of his most cherished hopes, could honestly accept a state of things it was beyond his power to change; he signed cheerfully, and kept dutifully, the peace of Constance, which left him little but a titular supremacy over the Lombard towns. At home, no preceding emperor had been so much respected or so prosperous. Uniting in himself the Suabian and Saxon families, he healed the long feud of Welf and Wurlingen; his prelates were faithful to him even against Rome; no turbulent rebel disturbed the public peace; and he crowned a glorious life with a happy death, leading the van of Christian chivalry against the Mussulman.'—P. 198.

To him belongs the peculiar honour of anticipating by centuries the development of a generous policy, by attaching to himself the great commercial cities, enfranchising many, and granting them, with municipal institutions, an independent jurisdiction. To the primitive order of German freemen, scarcely existing out of the towns, save in Suabia and Switzerland, he 'further commended himself by admitting them to knighthood, 'by restraining the licence of the nobles, imposing a public 'peace, making justice in every way more accessible and im-'partial.' Though he was 'the greatest of Crusaders,' however, we would rather give to Frederick II. than to him the praise of being the 'noblest type of mediæval character, in many of its shadows, in all its lights.'

As it was under the Hohenstauffen family the empire in its ideal dignity stood highest, partly owing to the genius of the princes of that illustrious house, partly owing to the ascendancy of Roman law, Mr. Bryce chooses this era as the fitting time for a review of 'the titles and claims by which it announced itself the representative of Rome's universal dominion.' Mr. Bryce briefly touches on the relations established between the crown imperial and Hungary, Poland, Denmark, France, Sweden, Spain, Naples, Cyprus, and Armenia. Venice, till her extinction by France and Austria in 1796, never recognised

within her domains any secular authority save her own. We do not think that Mr. Bryce does justice to the home-contained *imperium* of England: nor does he seem to give as much weight as is deserved to the explanation which he himself suggests of the instances which seem to contradict the imperial independence of the land. Such homage as the English crown rendered at any time to the imperial crown was not for England, but for such appanages of the English crown as were bound to do service to the empire. Although the crown must be bestowed by the pope, and the title of emperor was not assumed until the coronation, it was not a little strange and inconsistent that the rights of the emperor were held to be in full force before the crown was placed upon his head. He could summon synods, confirm papal elections, and exercise jurisdiction. It was the Rhine ruling the Tiber,—

‘Verso Tiberim regit ordine Rhenus.’

It was Barbarossa who first added the term ‘Holy’ to the previous title; a term which did not come into common use till the rise of the house which was the first to abandon it—the house of Hapsburg. The invention of the term was due in a great measure to the anti-papal policy of the house of Hohenstauffen. It was Hildebrand and his followers who had represented the empire, compared with the spiritual dominion, as secular, earthly, and profane. To counteract this notion, Frederick and his advisers began to use the title ‘Holy Empire’ in public documents, thereby asserting the divine institution of that which he represented. His house had well earned the hatred of the bishops of Rome. Great must have been the alarm of the pontiff on discovering the plans of Henry VI.—to consolidate in his family an hereditary empire; which, by obviating the recurrence of interregna, would have robbed the popedom of its most precious opportunities of aggrandizing itself at the expense of the empire. Henry had to rest content with getting his son Frederick chosen King of the Romans. On the sudden death of Henry, this election was set aside, and Innocent III., in the subsequent conflict, supported Otto of Brunswick against Philip, brother of the late emperor. Otto IV., on his election, proved so uncomfortable an emperor to his patron, that Innocent was compelled to depose and excommunicate him; and he was dethroned by that Frederick II.:—

‘Whom a tragic irony sent into the field of politics as the champion of the Holy See, whose hatred was to embitter his life and extinguish his house. Upon the events of that terrific strife for which emperor and pope girded themselves up for the last time [1212—1250], the narrative of Frederick II.’s career, with its romantic adventures, its sad picture of

marvellous powers lost on an age not ripe for them, blasted as by a curse in the moment of victory, it is not necessary, were it even possible, here to enlarge. That conflict did indeed determine the fortunes of the German kingdom no less than of the republics of Italy, but it was upon Italian ground that it was fought out, and it is to Italian history that its details belong. So, too, of Frederick himself. Out of the long array of the Germanic successors of Charles he is with Otto III. the only one who comes before us with a genius and a fame of character that are not those of a Northern or a Teuton. There dwelt in him, it is true, all the energy and knightly valour of his father Henry and his grandfather Barbarossa. But along with these, and changing their direction, were other gifts, inherited perhaps from his Italian mother, and fostered by his education among the orange groves of Palermo—a love of luxury and beauty: an intellect refined, subtle, philosophical. Through the mist of calumny and fable it is but dimly that the truth of the man can be discerned,—and the outlines that appear serve to quicken rather than to appease the curiosity with which we regard one of the most extraordinary personages in history. A sensualist, yet also a warrior and a politician; a profound lawgiver and an impassioned poet; in his youth fired by crusading fervour, in later life persecuting heretics while himself accused of blasphemy and unbelief; of winning manners and ardently beloved by his followers, but with the stain of more than one cruel deed upon his name; he was the marvel of his own generation, and succeeding ages looked back with awe, not unmingled with pity, upon the inscrutable figure of the last emperor who had braved all the terrors of the Church and died beneath her ban,—the last who had ruled from the sands of the ocean to the shores of the Sicilian sea. But while they pitied they condemned. The undying hatred of the Papacy threw around his memory a lurid light; him, and him alone of all the imperial line, Dante, the worshipper of the empire, must perforce deliver to the flames of hell.<sup>1</sup>

He had readily pledged himself to lead a crusade. He hesitated, and was excommunicated by Gregory IX.; he went, and was re-excommunicated for going; and he was excommunicated for the third time for returning. The strife which ensued was fierce and pitiless; yet, as Mr. Bryce well distinguishes, it was the King of Naples rather than the emperor who was attacked. But Frederick fell, and with him fell the empire: the principle triumphed which with unfaltering ambition, in days alike prosperous and adverse, a line of pontiffs had maintained, that Peter is the fountain of all power, temporal as well as spiritual; and Pope Clement IV. with a tender mercy, absolved Frederick's grandson, Conradin, the last of his line, from his inherited excommunication; but it was with an axe upon a public scaffold at Naples.<sup>1</sup> The pope was sole monarch of the Peninsula. For sixty years, no emperor appeared in Italy: and Gibbon says that the name was only remembered 'by the ignominious sale of the last relics of sovereignty.'

It is at this point that England, already by intermarriage

<sup>1</sup> Yet, in the thirteenth canto of his '*Inferno*,' the poet does some justice to the Emperor in the words put into the mouth of Pietro della Vigne, his chancellor.

<sup>2</sup> It was the deed of Charles of France, but the suggestion of Clement.



more than once connected with the empire, appears upon the stage. A wealthy and not formidable candidate for the imperial crown was found in Richard Plantagenet, Earl of Cornwall, son of John, whose ancestress, the daughter of Henry I. had been married to Henry V. The Emperor Richard was but a *fainéant* emperor; and at his death Germany was reduced to a fearful state of internal disorganization. The long and dismal interregnum was closed by the accession of the house of Hapsburg.<sup>1</sup> It is to this time, if to any time more than another, the caustic observation of Voltaire may be applied—that the empire was neither holy, nor Roman, nor an empire. The accession of the house of Hapsburg marks the beginning of the third epoch of the empire; it marks a time too when the monarchical principle was establishing itself more strongly than ever in France and England; yet such was the fatal influence of the imperial over the regal functions, that in Germany the monarchy had in a manner succumbed. Not only had the emperors failed to make good their legal rights to name or confirm—rights that in the days of the Ottos had never been brought into question; their own elections were now brought under pontifical review. Such a claim had been advanced so far back as the time of Innocent III., whose ‘ingenuity discovered for it an historical basis;’ for he affirmed that it was by the favour of the pope that the empire was translated from the woman Irene to the great Charles. Mr. Bryce speaks very gently of this flagrant fiction, which was never heard of for three centuries. But the empire had not only been vanquished by the Church; it was in great pecuniary distress. The secretary of Frederick III. declared that the revenues of the empire scarcely covered its expenses; and his political position considered in full, the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire was little better off than a modern emperor of Mexico. ‘Every prospect of reform within or of war without, was at the mercy of a jealous Diet.’ The Diet consisted of three orders—electors, princes, cities; and these were careful of their own interests, and proportionately jealous of one another. The dangerous uncertainty of elections which hitherto existed was remedied by Charles IV., the fifth emperor of the Hapsburgh line, and son of that blind king of Bohemia who, falling at Cressy, left to our Prince of Wales the device of three plumes: that same Charles IV. who only succeeded to the empire on the refusal of the English parliament to allow Edward III. to accept the dignity to which he had been already elected. Charles, by his ‘Golden Bull,’ legalized the independence of the electors and

<sup>1</sup> In a note Mr. Bryce tells us that the castle of Hapsburg is in the Aargen, on the banks of Aar, and near the line of railway from Olten to Zurich.

the powerlessness of the crown. There was thus a combination of the elective and the hereditary principle. The authority of S. Thomas Aquinas is quoted, assigning the appointment of the seven princes to Gregory V., and the fiction was circulated by the clergy. Already, indeed, the ancient right vesting in the whole body of freemen, as at first, and then in the aristocracy, became vested in a small body, as at the election of Lothar II. A.D. 1125, which, exercising what was called the right of pre-taxation, chose the monarch, and presented him for approval to the rest. Thus the way was prepared for the final reform.

'The origin of that College is a matter somewhat intricate and obscure. It is mentioned A.D. 1152, and in somewhat clearer terms in 1198, as a distinct body; but without anything to show who composed it. First in A.D. 1265 does a letter of Pope Urban IV. say, that by immemorial custom the right of choosing the Roman king belonged to seven persons. Of these seven, three, the Archbishops of Mentz, Treves, and Cologne, pastors of the three richest Transalpine sees, represented the German Church; the other four ought, according to the ancient constitution, to have been the dukes of the four nations, Franks, Suabians, Saxons, Bavarians, to whom also had belonged the four great offices of the imperial household. But of these dukedoms two were now extinct, and their place and power in the state, as well as the household offices they had held, had descended upon two principalities of more recent origin, those namely of the Palatinate of the Rhine and the Margravate of Brandenburg. The Saxon duke, though with greatly narrowed dominions, retained his vote and office of arch-marshal, and the claim of his Bavarian compeer would have been equally indisputable had it not so happened that both he and the Palsgrave of the Rhine were members of the great house of Wittelsbach. That one family should hold two votes out of seven seemed so dangerous to the state that it was made a ground of objection to the Bavarian duke, and gave an opening to the pretensions of the King of Bohemia, who, though not properly a Teutonic prince, might on the score of rank and power assert himself the equal of any one of the electors. The dispute between these rival claimants, as well as all the rules and requisites of the election, were settled by Charles IV. in the Golden Bull, [A.D. 1356] thenceforward a fundamental law of the empire. He decided in favour of Bohemia, of which he was then king; fixed Frankfort as the place of election; named the Archbishop of Mentz convener of the electoral college; gave to Bohemia the first, to the Count Palatine the second, place among the secular electors. A majority of votes was in all cases to be decisive. As to each electorate there was attached a great office, it was supposed that this was the title by which the vote was possessed, though it was in truth rather an effect than a cause. The three prelates were archchancellors of Germany, Gaul, and Italy respectively: Bohemia cupbearer, the Palsgrave seneschal, Saxony marshal, and Brandenburg chamberlain.'

**We shall make no apology for prolonging the extract:—**

'These arrangements, under which disputed elections became far less frequent, remained undisturbed till A.D. 1618, when on the breaking out of the Thirty Years' War,' the Emperor Ferdinand II. by an unwarranted

---

One of the causes which precipitated the great European conflict—the few in history whose results have been at all proportioned to its character—was the Elector of Cologne. Gebhard, becoming Protestant to marry Countess Agnes of

stretch of prerogative, deprived the Palsgrave Frederick (King of Bohemia, and husband of Elizabeth, the daughter of James I. of England) of his electoral vote, and transferred it to his own partisan, Maximilian of Bavaria. At the peace of Westphalia, the Palsgrave was reinstated as an eighth elector, Bavaria retaining her place. The sacred number having been once broken through, less scruple was felt in making further changes. In A.D. 1692, the Emperor Leopold I. conferred a ninth electorate on the house of Brunswick Lüneburgh, which was then in possession of the duchy of Hanover, and in A.D. 1708, the assent of the Diet thereto was obtained. It was in this way that English kings came to vote at the election of a Roman emperor. It is not a little curious that the only potentate who still continues to entitle himself elector,<sup>1</sup> should be one who never did (and of course never can now) join in electing an emperor, having been, under the arrangements of the Old Empire, a simple landgrave. In A.D. 1803 Napoleon, among other sweeping changes in the Germanic constitution, procured the extinction of the electorate of Cologne and Treves, annexing them to France, and gave the title of elector, as the highest after that of king, to the Duke of Wirtemberg, the Margrave of Baden, the Landgrave of Hesse Cassel, and the Archbishop of Salzburg. Three years afterwards the empire itself ended, and the title became meaningless.<sup>2</sup>—P. 253-5.

These seven had the power of election, not of creation. This rested with God.

Mr. Bryce's fifteenth chapter is no unimportant contribution to the philosophy of history, and will amply repay perusal. The great event of the last three hundred years is the formation of nationalities—something different from the existence of nations, of which our author speaks elsewhere—with distinct language and character, habits and institutions. It was just then, when the presence of a harmonizing and controlling power was most needed, that the empire succumbed. It was just then, what from the very moment of its own hard-won, and, indeed, ill-won triumph, might have been foreseen, that the papacy was proved to be unequal to the position of arbiter of the nations. The empire was peace. The oldest and noblest title the emperor held was *Imperator pacificus*. The pontiff has, if we accept the verdict of history, as little succeeded in realizing this title as the emperor. Perhaps the only imperial function of this emperor which the mediæval popes left unappropriated was that of creating kings.<sup>3</sup> The theory of the empire was as little reduced to fact as has been that of the papacy. Indeed, the

---

Mansfield. His Calvinism ruined him. Saxony, Brandenburg, and the Palatinate, were already Lutheran. The violence of the Protestants was greatly inflamed by the Pope venturing, for the first time, [and the last] to deprive a prince of the empire of the imperial dignities.

<sup>1</sup> The Elector of Hesse Cassel thus enables us to distinguish between the Grand Duke of Hesse Darmstadt and the Landgrave of Hesse Homburg.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Bryce in a note tells us that the title of Majesty was granted by the Imperial Chancery to England and Sweden in 1633, to France in 1641.

only occasion on which the empire exhibited itself as really an international power, was when Sigismund convened the Council of Constance. Aided by an Avignonese pontiff, Henry VII. seemed to achieve a momentary triumph for the empire; but the Tuscan fever, and the poisoned chalice in the Eucharist, triumphed over the heroic emperor, A.D. 1313; and 'with him' ends the history of the empire in Italy, and Dante's book is 'an epitaph instead of a prophecy.'

Mr. Bryce gives an interesting sketch of Rome and its politics in her middle age, with notices of Arnold, Rienzi, and Porcaro, the last martyr of the cause of municipal independence. The failure to attain freedom during the three centuries which lie between Arnold and Porcaro, the author ascribes to the disadvantage under which Rome laboured of possessing neither that foreign trade nor manufacturing industry which enabled Venice, Pisa, and Genoa, to attain such eminence. With an inadequate harbour at a distance, and a desert at her gates, the productive energies of Rome have been paralyzed for centuries. But we can hardly resist the conviction that in an age when commercial success is the all-in-all of national or municipal existence, this whole condition of things will be changed, and that, whether Rome becomes the Italian capital or a free city, she may yet, by a sudden revival of trade, attain the wealth which is ascribed to her in the language of divine mystery. Maximilian, the most notable of the late emperors, who followed his ancestor, Rudolf, after an interval of two centuries, was really the founder of the Hapsburg dynasty. The empire became hereditary about the same time that the Eastern empire passed away, and a new world was discovered; and it must ever remain one of the wonders of history that, at such a juncture, both empire and papacy failed to realize the gain; that release from the jealousy and power of a rival brought no increase of vigour to the one; that the commercial zeal of that remarkable time brought no wealth or energy to the Eternal City; that the discovery of another world to be evangelized, and the sense one would have thought inevitable of increased responsibility, brought neither purer counsels nor clearer insight to the self-styled Universal Bishop. All the advantages of that great crisis, which so gifted a prince as Charles V. was so well qualified to gather in, were wasted through the evil counsels of the Vatican, and the insolence with which a sensual pontiff repulsed a German monk. The work of Luther was consummated in the peace of Westphalia. The empire had become identified with the house of Hapsburg; and that memorable council was influenced in no slight degree by the writings of Hippolytus à Lapide, more familiarly known to us by his real name of Chemnitz, who,

arguing against the whole Romano-papal idea of the empire, did not hesitate to urge in so many words, *Domus Austriacæ extirpatio*. The empire lingered on, impotent for good. It could neither prevent the seizure of Silesia nor the partitionment of Poland, to a chieftain of which unhappy nation the imperial princes were indebted for deliverance from the Turk. The house of Hapsburg had supplied in many instances respectable princes, but their policy was invariably dictated by selfishness, the worst vice a ruler can be guilty of. It is difficult to guess what change, if any, would have been given to the course of events had the wishes of half the Electoral College in 1658 been successful; and the crown bestowed on Louis XIV., who afterwards used to be called the 'Hereditary Enemy of the Holy Empire.' It was but one of many projects always frustrated, to set aside the Hapsburg family. But another shortly arose to give effect to the policy of Louis. It was Napoleon's intention at one time to oust the Hapsburgs, and himself become the head of the Holy Roman Empire. One is at a loss to conceive how this wonderful man, who went so far on the way as to account himself the successor of Charlemagne, reached this idea so slowly. He had overthrown two emperors; the representatives respectively of the Eastern and Western Cæsars. At this point the Invisible Hand, so often felt in history, gave a new direction to his arms, and reserved for the coming 'Man of the Earth' the throne of universal monarchy, leaving to the quondam elector of Brandenburg the task of dis inheriting the successor of Rudolf and Maximilian. Goethe—it will be our last extract from Mr. Bryce,—

'Has described the uneasiness with which in the days of his childhood the burghers of his native Frankfort saw the walls of the Roman Hall covered with the portraits of emperor after emperor, till space was left for few, at last for one. In A.D. 1792, Francis the Second mounted the throne of Augustus, and the last place was filled. Three years before there had arisen in the Western horizon a little cloud no bigger than a man's hand, and now the heaven was black with storms of rain. There was a prophecy dating from the first days of the empire's decline, that when all things were falling to ruin, and nakedness rife in the world, a second Frankish emperor should arise, to purge and heal, to bring back peace, and to purify religion.'—P. 393.

Yet here have we another Napoleon, Rome still in his hands and Europe immeshed in his policy, and the empire palpitating under its death-wound.

We have followed Mr. Bryce with pleasure, charmed by his ingenuity, gratified by his industry, not surprised by his Trans-Tweedian theology: occasionally conscious of a feeling of weariness arising from his repeating himself. In our estimate of the

whole period with its 160 popes,<sup>1</sup> we shall perhaps differ from him. We hold that all the good the Holy Roman Empire did, it did indirectly. In this way it fostered amongst the half-civilized nationalities order and law and faith. These it was divinely ordained should increase, while the empire, in accomplishing its mission, like the divine hermit, was ordained to decrease. All this we dutifully and thankfully acknowledge. All the empire's direct aims, with little exception, appear to us either worthless or wicked. The creature of selfishness and fraud, it maintained a feverish existence by the propagation of a falsehood as gross as one of Falstaff's: that it was the heir and representative of the Augustan empire. In any career of conquest and aggression, as that of Napoleon's, we gauge the work done, and the doer of it, on their own merits. But a theocratic institution, not as it fails, but as it is false to its own Nature, must be weighed in other scales, and all the more so because a theocratic institution in Christendom is that same kind of invasion of the rights of the Lord Christ which in the Church is perpetrated by the papal claim of supremacy. Indeed it might be fairly contended that those services which we admit the Lower Empire indirectly rendered to Europe, came not from the empire at all, but directly from the refining and softening influences of the Church: and, confirmatory of this, attention might be drawn to the happier history of those kingdoms which were virtually, if not actually, free from imperial influence. The anointed agent of Church and world, the empire, failed in the only two great trials which it was called to face. It neither saved the Church from the Lutheran schism, nor Constantinople from the Turk. Fraud is always fraud, and falsehood falsehood; and it is trifling with the sacred reality of words, and the more responsible conclusions of a sound judgment, to determine differently on these subjects because they happen to come before us in history.

And in proportion as we bring ourselves to adopt the true, if severe, criterion as regards the empire, shall we form a truer estimate of the position of the papacy in the middle age. It was the pope who gave realization to the dreams of Charlemagne. He assisted to create the Lower Empire. Whatever indirect services the empire rendered to society, were rendered during the time the pope acknowledged the supremacy of the crown. And so much the less is society indebted to the popes of the middle age. No sooner was the instrument proved to be useful than all the efforts of the popes were directed to undermine and

---

<sup>1</sup> There is a useful Chronological Table prefixed, which gives the names of the popes, 255 in all, not reckoning the anti-popes, about thirty in number. The last is defective in the records of the anti-popes.



destroy it; to sap the foundations of all loyalty; to bring in question, ay, and more than bring in question, the inviolability of oaths; to shake—by a frantic diplomacy, which made war a holy institution, and carnage in another sense than the poet recked of the Daughter of God—the very hopes of humanity. The Church herself indeed seems to have been penetrated with a sense of her own utter degradation; and she who, of her previous ninety-eight pontiffs—who ruled from S. Peter included for eight hundred years—had canonized more than one half, has ventured to canonize during her theocratical millennium only five, out of a number reckoning nearly one hundred and sixty.

And now, even while we are writing, the heirs of Luther are raking together the spoils of the annihilated empire, and Italy and Rome are demanding to be restored to themselves; and care upon care is weighing down the heart of the aged pontiff, suspicious of his subjects whom his priesthood have never succeeded either in ruling or in converting, and depending upon carnal aid with that immemorial reliance which prompted Leo to call Charles from beyond the Alps. There is no Christian heart—we had almost said there is no human heart—that will refuse to pray for the suffering old man, the prince without a peer to befriend him: the father forsaken of all his own children. Yet be our suffrages rendered not only that he may be comforted and supported, but also that he may be enabled to rise to the full conception of the character of the Apostle whom he represents,—the fiefless and homeless pastor of the Church,—who claimed no crown, nor from one end of his diocese to the other, from Euphrates to the Tiber, owned earth enough in which to make his grave. May it be granted to Pius IX. to learn, however late, that the theocratical dreams which his office has inherited from the empire, and a love for which seems to constitute the last infirmity of his mind, are, and have ever been, the greatest curse of the Church of God.

ART. IV.—*The Church and the World.* Essays on Questions of the Day. By various Writers. Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. London: Longmans. 1866.

It seems to be pretty well understood among *littérateurs* now that a 'movement,' whether ecclesiastical or secular, theological or scientific, must receive an impetus from a bundle of essays in order to insure its progress. The original 'Oxford Essays' and 'Cambridge Essays' had no connexion except that which they derived from the binder: but the gentlemen who were bound up in that fagot of Neologian sticks called 'Essays and Reviews,' did the rough work of pioneers in a novel style of associated literary partnership. Alpine climbing has been stimulated in the same manner. The Irish Church,—that *crux* of Establishmentarians,—has had its volume of Essayists. The Ultramontanists, under the presidency of Dr. Manning, cheered up their drooping spirits, and made a little figure by the like expedient. But all these efforts must give place to the present magnificent enterprise, for the bulk of matter, variety of subject, and number of contributors. This volume contains eighteen essays by as many different writers. The questions treated in its pages range over a wide field; and the list of contents looks like the commingling of papers read at a Social Science meeting and a Church Congress. Infanticide and Clerical Celibacy; Architecture and the Conscience Clause; Hospital Nursing and Ritualism;—these headings give a fair notion of the scope of the book, and justify what we have remarked upon it. The Editor introduces his goodly company of essayists with a preface, in which he informs us that 'the several Authors' are responsible only for the statements contained in their own 'contributions.' This is a stereotyped formula with which such volumes as the present are labelled. It corresponds to that sinister word 'limited' which Joint-stock Companies add to the titles of their schemes. We, for our part, confess that we are unable to appreciate the value of this saving clause. It did not protect the notorious 'Essayists' from being held, each and every of them, a *particeps criminis*, as regarded the general drift of the book; and why should it do more for our friends now lying before us? Any number of men clubbed together under one Editor to produce a book setting forth certain opinions, besides the part each plays as an individual, conjointly create an atmosphere which we may call the tone,

views, or tendency of the volume. This is inevitable; and this is something, over and above their separate responsibilities, for which all are responsible. In the second paragraph of his preface Mr. Shipley, though without appearing to be aware of it, repeats the first paragraph somewhat more elaborately. We can see no use in this anxiety to disclaim the natural consequences of association.

But let us to the book itself. The eighteen essays which compose it exhibit no arrangement as they stand; at the same time they are capable of being grouped to a certain extent. Nos. 1, 5, 7, and 14 may form one group; and perhaps No. 4, on Cathedral Reform, may be thrown in as an appendix to this set. Nos. 2, 17, and 18 fall together very naturally. So also do Nos. 10, 11, and 16. The remaining seven articles are isolated as regards their subject-matter, and claim no fellowship by which they may be linked on to any of the others. We will glance at these last first, and then deal with the groups as groups.

The third essay, entitled, 'Infanticide: its Cure and Cause,' is a short, but, as far as it goes, an able treatment of a sad and very urgent question, which presses hard upon the conscience of the English public (if it have a conscience) at the present day; which is confessedly a blot upon our boasted civilization; and which puts our Christianity to the blush, and makes it hang its head and keep silence before the reproaches of its too exultant enemies. The subject is, indeed, most complicated. Difficulties beset it on all sides, and these difficulties spring from the most opposite sources. A false sentiment screens the mother who murders her illegitimate child from the extreme penalty to which she is in strict law amenable; while a one-sided virtuousness visits with the severest infliction of social degradation the woman who has fallen from honour, at the same time that it leaves the man uncensured. Again, popular modesty in England shrinks from facing, what is absurdly called, the 'social evil' as a disease. It does not attempt to treat it, because, it fears lest, by the unavoidable recognition which treatment involves, it should seem to tolerate it. The idea of localising the vice is shocking, because it is giving permission to that which is not permissible. And this is, under one aspect of the case, just sentiment. No system of public morality can be countenanced by a Christian, which gives a place to immorality as a necessary element in the social scheme. English feeling revolts at the thought of prostitution being legalized by the civil authorities. It has to the Christian mind one remedy—extirpation. Whether, however, police regulations are not called upon to keep within bounds what they cannot prevent, is a question of larger incidence, and

while public duties must proceed on lower motives, the greater evil remains that there is absolutely no check on vice, either by religious prohibition or social regulation. And yet, as a matter of fact, there is no city in Europe where this kind of vice is so much on the surface as in London. Nowhere does temptation so dog the steps of youth as in its streets. Another difficulty in dealing with sins of unchastity is, that when they take a criminal form, and have to be dealt with legally, the structure of the tribunals is not such as to insure a high and delicate principle according to which the claims of morality on the one hand, and mercy on the other, shall be truly adjusted. And this is their misfortune rather than their fault. It is inherent in the nature of the cases they have to deal with. Infanticide and concealment of birth are brought before the same tribunals as theft, murder, forgery, assault, libel, and uttering false coin. They are regarded by the law all alike as crimes. They are offences against the commonwealth, and endanger the safety of the citizen in person, character, or property. The law tries, condemns, and punishes them all from this point of view. But jurymen, who are the administrators of the law, are not so single-minded as the law. They do not keep to one point of view in regarding the crimes they deal with. When called upon to deliberate over crimes which take their rise from unchastity—such as infanticide and concealment of birth—they invariably moralize. Hence the uncertainty and inconsistency of their verdicts in such cases. A thief or a forger they will give a verdict upon as a mere criminal, and with an unbiassed consideration of the facts submitted to them. But when required to try a woman on the charge of murdering her illegitimate child they are often carried away by their feelings against their judgments. They, quite unconsciously, perhaps, turn their thoughts upon the non-criminal sin of unchastity which has led to the criminal sin of murder. We speak thus advisedly. Unchastity is a sin which the law does not recognise as a crime; therefore we call it non-criminal: but murder is a sin which the law does recognise as a crime; therefore we call it criminal. Now juries, as agents of the law, ought to look to the crime, and pay no attention to the sin. But sin and crime excite very different feelings in the minds of men. They condemn criminals, but pity sinners; and for this reason, that sin is an offence against Divine law, which they do not administer, but crime is an offence against human law, which they do administer. If juries could be empanelled who would regard infanticide simply as a crime, and close their eyes to the preventient sin of unchastity, then verdicts of wilful murder would be found without recommendations to mercy; and verdicts of

acquittal in spite of facts to the contrary, would not so often startle our notions of judicial consistency. There would be no moralizing. But sin is associated in men's minds with a fall, a misfortune, temptation, and all the various circumstances which are supposed to be extenuating. In a case of infanticide the law punishes because murder has been committed, not because the child was the fruit of a sinful connexion. And yet the case appears to the jury so deeply coloured with the precedent fact of illegitimacy that they cannot be got to look at it as a mere murder, although it is only as a murder that the law commands them to try it. In short, the verdicts which juries deliver in cases of infanticide are, for the most part, the result of considerations which refer to facts and circumstances entirely beyond the cognisance of criminal law. The minds of jurymen are made up by the sin of unchastity, and delivered upon the crime of child-murder. Hence their anomalous and inconsistent character.

We have discussed this point rather lengthily because we feel that the common reason assigned for the strange verdicts given in cases of infanticide, namely, that men set no value upon the life of a new-born infant, and cannot be got to look upon its wilful destruction as important enough to be called murder, does not solve the whole question. Mr. Humble's essay is full of thoughtful suggestions concerning the religious treatment of the evil, and valuable hints as to practical steps to be taken towards that object—suggestions and hints which had best be received in his own words. There is one remark of his which we will notice before we take leave of his essay. He observes that the high morality of Ireland is attributable to the habit of confession, while the low morality of Scotland is to be accounted for by the absence of that habit. The facts as regards the two nations we believe to be pretty correct, but we have heard very different reasons assigned for them. Scotchmen are guided in their morals by considerations of worldly prudence, and do not contract early marriages. But Irishmen are equally remarkable for their reckless imprudence, and maintain the moral reputation of their country by marrying before they are able to keep a wife. The reasons are at least plausible. With regard to Mr. Humble's idea, we are afraid it will not serve if generalized over all Christian countries, and the morality of the confessing communities be compared with that of the non-confessing.

The sixth essay, by Dr. Alfred Meadows, upon 'Hospital and Workhouse Nursing,' need receive no further notice at our hands than a passing word of unqualified approbation. As a professional man, he speaks *ex cathedra* upon the subject he deals with; and ever since his paper has been published, as

well as before that time, the press has teemed with the scandalous revelations of workhouse inhumanity and hospital mismanagement. A like weight of professional authority attaches to the fifteenth essay, on 'The Study of Foreign Gothic Architecture, and its Influence on English Art,' by Mr. Street. He certainly has a peculiar claim to be heard on the subject he has taken up; for he, more than any one else has—to use the cant phrase of a party—caused the modern Gothic of this country to change from being frigidly Anglican to becoming warmly Catholic.

Of the remaining four articles which we have classed as isolated, we have space to note little more than the titles. Mr. Blenkinsopp furnishes a paper on the 'Re-union of the Church,' remarkable for its excellent temper and width of view. It asserts positively the substantial character of the Anglican Communion as an integral part of the Catholic Church, and regards the re-union of Christendom as acting with impartial force upon all the parts, and drawing them together by moving each one towards the centre of truth. It is free from the blemish which disfigures the writings of some unionists, who think themselves bound to apologise for whatever is Anglican, and to flatter whatever is Roman; who seem to think that the English Church should make advances to the Roman Church with some such expressions on her lips as those Miranda addresses to Ferdinand, in the 'Tempest':—

"To be your fellow  
You may deny-me; but I'll be your servant  
Whether you will or no."

The ninth paper is anonymous, for which, the Editor says, 'the reason is obvious.' We can only wonder that the reasons for its total exclusion from the book were not equally obvious to him. The heading misleads. It stands thus:—'The last Thirty Years in the Church of England: an Autobiography.' We expected from this to find an interesting historiette of the great movement commonly called Tractarian, a sort of supplement to the fascinating 'Apologia' of Dr. Newman; and we must confess to our disappointment at discovering it to be nothing but a relation of religious experiences of the most personal and private character, shorn of the only thing which could give them the slightest interest to the general reader—the name of the individual. We should be sorry to say anything that would pain the feelings of the lady—it is a lady—who has volunteered this piece of spiritual self-dissection. But we all know how largely the religious biographies of the 'Evangelical' party are composed of passages of morbid introspection reproduced from diaries and note-books, and all agree in regarding them as singu-



larly unprofitable. The 'Autobiography' in question is just such a passage. It has no useful purpose to attain that we can see, unless it be to recommend, as by a side-wind, the practice of auricular confession, and certainly its recommendation is damaging. The tone of the paper is neither healthy, hopeful, nor instructive, and we think, on every account, that it had better have been omitted. The subject of confession might well have been treated in a paper professedly devoted to it; but the conditions under which it is here presented are neither judicious nor practical. Of the 'Conscience Clause' we have had enough so far as writing and talking go, but Canon Trevor has given us a little more in No. 12. When we say that No. 13 is a paper on 'The Eucharistic Sacrifice,' by Mr. Medd, we need add nothing to recommend it to the perusal of all who desire to learn from a wise and learned theologian upon that high subject.

The first group of essays may be clustered together under the title, 'The Christian Ministry: its Education, its Condition, and its Organization.' Upon the first of these aspects of the subject, Mr. Rogers contributes a paper, headed 'University Extension.' The second is suggested by Mr. Vaux's article on 'Clerical Celibacy.' The third comprehends the essays 'On the Revival of Religious Confraternities,' by Mr. Baring-Gould; on 'Vows, and their Relation to Religious Communities,' by Mr. Carter; and, practically, though not so obviously, that on 'Cathedral Reform,' by Mr. Walcott. It is but lightly that we can touch upon the great variety of topics presented to us in this and the other groups of essays, which we have to notice; and what we shall say will rather run parallel with the remarks of our essayists than arise directly out of them.

One, and that not the least remarkable, of the many remarkable facts which distinguish the present age of the English Church is, that, while throughout her ranks, both lay and clerical, she is animated with an activity and vigour which she has not exhibited for centuries, there is a decline going on in the numbers, and also in the quality, of the candidates for holy orders. The whole bench of bishops utters the complaint that at the ordinations fewer and fewer men present themselves, and these more and more inferior in ability and learning. The prospectus of the Curates' Augmentation Fund sets the melancholy truth before the public in accurate statistics, and confidently proposes as a remedy, that all curates should have a certain prospect of at least £200 a year within a definite period. We heartily wish the Fund success. Others declare that earnest and able men are deterred from taking orders because the clergy are so hampered by dogma, fettered by Church laws, and tyrannized over by bishops. This is an objection on paper, but not

in fact ; for there never was a time when the Church of England was so lawless, and her bishops so powerless, as the present. Another reason assigned is the opening to competition of the civil and military appointments. This, as Mr. Rogers explains, is totally inadequate to account for the diminution and deterioration. The truth, no doubt, is that all these influences, and others besides, are operating to bring about the result. We shall not pursue the investigation of them beyond the line suggested by the words 'University Extension.'

We are inclined to think that some confusion exists in the minds of people who deplore most loudly the present condition of supply and demand in the clerical market. Not that we question for a moment the facts, or that we deny them to be deplorable ; but we wish to point out that when the question is discussed, as it is in Mr. Roger's essay, and as we find it elsewhere, under the title of 'University Extension,' there are two distinct and independent subjects under contemplation. One subject is the decrease of candidates for holy orders ; the other subject is the decrease of the number of graduates amongst the candidates. When we speak of university extension with reference to the clerical profession, we aim at supplying not only more candidates, but more candidates of a certain kind ; and this object may obviously be obtained without adding to the total number of candidates. For it is quite possible to conceive that such measures might be taken with regard to the cheapening and facilitating the course of education at Oxford and Cambridge, that all the men who would otherwise take orders as literates, should be induced to qualify themselves as graduates, and yet the Church have a scant supply of ministers. Supposing ~~this~~ to be the prevailing desire, it is clear that it is a reaction from the motives which set on foot such places as S. Bees and S. Aidan's. The object in founding those institutions was to increase the number of men ; the object in extending the universities is to increase the number of graduates in the ranks of the clergy. The institutions for turning out literate candidates were started, not because the number of graduate candidates fell off, but because many men desired to take holy orders who could not afford an University education. It was not a question then, whether the demand could be met, but whether the number of channels should be increased through which the supply should flow. But now the supply from all sources is insufficient, and the falling-off is chiefly amongst graduates. Hence the call for University extension.

It may be well to examine the reasons which prompt the desire to increase the number of graduate candidates, as distinct from increasing the numbers of candidates generally ; for it is

perfectly plain that the end in view would not be answered even though S. Bees and King's College were to pour forth a stream of literates as plentifully as the exigencies of the Church demanded. Mr. Lecky, in his recent work, has expressed in very neatly turned phrases the old-fashioned description of an English clergyman. He writes:—'In England at least, the accomplishments of a scholar, and the refinement of a gentleman, blending with the pure and noble qualities of a religious teacher, have produced a class type which is scarcely sullied by fanaticism; and is probably, on the whole, the highest, as it is the most winning that has ever been attained.'<sup>1</sup> This is very kind of Mr. Lecky; but the worst of it is that people begin to complain that 'the accomplishments of a scholar and the refinement of a gentleman' are not such common attributes of the English clergy as they used to be, and that there is reason to fear that they will become more scarce still. It is, moreover, asserted that a significant correspondence exists between the decline of these qualities among the clergy and the increase of the number of literates. Consequently, it is thought that the best way to check this deterioration, and to maintain, and even improve, the scholarly and gentlemanly tone of the English priesthood, is to make such reforms in the two great universities as shall attract to them those candidates for holy orders who now go forth as literates. It is difficult to discuss this subject without giving offence to those excellent men who are doing the Church's work without the decoration of a university degree; but we hope we may avoid such a misfortune by saying beforehand that we have met, amongst the clergy, with graduates who were not gentlemen, and with gentlemen who were not graduates. Having by this double-edged compliment cleared the ground of scandals, let us see what are the exact bearings of this generally-expressed desire for gentlemanly clergymen in respect of university extension.

Taking things as they are at the two universities, it is agreed on all hands that the training there given is more likely to turn out gentlemen than the training afforded at any other places of education. The reasons for this are so trite and so true that it is unnecessary to repeat them. Two questions, however, arising out of this admitted fact, seem to us to deserve attention, though we do not remember to have seen them anywhere discussed. One question is, How far do 'the accomplishments of a scholar and the refinement of a gentleman' (we accept this formula, as accurately expressing the desideratum), which are generally supposed to characterize a graduate clergyman, depend upon the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe*, vol. ii. p. 62.

present educational system and social habits of the universities; and is it likely that the alteration in these respects, which would certainly result from the cheapening and enlarging process, commonly called university extension, would influence the production of the desired qualities? The other question is, Are scholarship and refinement indispensable to the composition of an earnest and efficient parish-priest? With regard to the former question we may observe, that it seems to have escaped notice that the evil (if evil it be) for which a remedy is sought, is not rightly expressed by saying that men who take orders do not take degrees. This result might have been brought about by various causes other than that which is at work in the present case. For example, it is conceivable that the universities might be so thoroughly unchurched and even unchristianized, might be so completely handed over to the secular power, both as to government and style of education, that candidates for holy orders would feel repelled rather than attracted by their tone and system. But the true way of describing the evil is, we believe, to say that the class of men who take degrees at the university are not the class of men who take holy orders. This places the subject in its right light, and shows it to be, what it really is, a question of change in the social grade of candidates for orders. The priesthood is passing from one rank of society to a lower. Perhaps this statement may startle; perhaps it may offend; but is it not true? It is the assumption upon which the movement for university extension, in respect of candidates for holy orders, is based. We share deeply in the regret which this statement excites; but the transition has not proceeded so far, nor is it going on so rapidly, but that a good and effectual restraint may be put upon it. And this brings forward the question, What steps can be taken to increase the number of graduate candidates for holy orders? We confess we have little faith in those schemes which go entirely upon the cheap tack; or, again, in those which propose relaxing almost every regulation and abolishing every custom which combine to make the character of an university man. If Oxford and Cambridge are desirable above all others as places of clerical education, they are so by reason of their peculiarities, which distinguish them from all others. It is absurd to make them quite different from what they are, in order to extend their benefits to a larger number of men. The tea in a particular tea-pot may be excellent, but its excellence will not be imparted to the whole circle by adding water *ad libitum*. And yet a good deal of what has been said and written upon the subject involves this absurdity of watering down university education, in order to extend the advantages it originally possessed. The fact is, that the ques-

tion of university extension, though at first raised to meet the particular want of graduate candidates for holy orders, immediately expanded much more widely and generally as soon as it came to be discussed. All special thought of the clerical view was laid aside, or rather merged in schemes which made no more account of the Church than of law or medicine.<sup>1</sup> And how far-reaching these schemes, according to the views of some active agitators, would be, may be learned from what Mr. Goldwin Smith has recently put forward in his 'Letter to the Rev. C. W. Sandford,' upon the 'Elections to the Hebdomadal Council:—

'Finally,' writes Mr. Smith at p. 19 of his letter, 'there is the great question of all, that of University extension, which will assuredly not be settled by the erection of a Poor College. My own conviction has long been that it will not be settled by any practicable addition to the number of students here, but that as in the Middle Ages the nation came to Oxford, Oxford under our present condition of society will have, conjointly with Cambridge, to go to the nation—to go to the nation in the way of supervision, affiliation, inspection, central direction of education; for education, till it has emerged from its present state of confusion at all events, must be more or less centralized somewhere, and to secure its independence of political influence, it should be centralized in the Universities rather than in the place which is also the centre of political power.'

It is quite plain that this, or anything like this, view of University extension will not meet the demands of those who desire to see more Oxford and Cambridge graduates—as graduates are at present understood to be, and as the Church is supposed to be the better for having them in her ministry—presenting themselves for Holy Orders.

What then, it will be asked, is to be done? An additional college which shall offer special encouragement to candidates for Holy Orders, is certainly one important step; and it is to be earnestly hoped that the Keble Memorial may be wisely framed to achieve this step. But beyond this, we think, something may be done by the old colleges in the way of restoring that regard for the interests of the Church which their secularization by modern legislation has so greatly impaired. If there be left amongst them any true love for the Church, let them assign a portion of their revenues to found exhibitions for

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Daubeny, in his 'Letter to the Provost of Oriel on University Extension,' says that he did not attend the preliminary meeting held in the hall of Oriel, because the circular which convened it implied that the subject to be discussed related to 'University Extension, with especial reference to the education of persons needing assistance, and desirous of admission into the Christian ministry;' but that he afterwards found 'that no sooner had the question of University Extension with reference to young men intended for Holy Orders been mooted, than a feeling found expression both amongst the clergy and the laity present, that the subject under consideration ought not to be so limited.'

the special benefit of undergraduates intending to take Holy Orders. Although Mr. Rogers (p. 11) speaks of the additional supply that would thus be furnished as 'so trivial as to be almost nothing: so slight as not to meet the demand in any appreciable degree;' we think that it would be something appreciable, and also that no other scheme we have heard of or can devise would be effectual. We ought to add that we do not concur in the opinions of those who desire that all clergymen should be graduates—not because we do not wish to see such a result, but simply because we do not believe it attainable. If the present supply of candidates were sufficient, and it were merely a question of making them all graduates, then this view might be entertained. But the Church wants more men to minister in her service, and she will find employment for all the graduates that the most skilful plans can draft into her ranks, as well as for all the literates who may be recruited from other quarters.<sup>1</sup>

We must briefly advert to the other question—Are 'scholarship and refinement' indispensable to the composition of an earnest and efficient parish priest? Many people will answer emphatically, Yes: and we ourselves have no desire to say, No. At the same time, as the subject is on the carpet, it may be as well to inquire a little into this 'gentleman-theory' of the priesthood. As for its origin, it is quite manifest that it cannot claim the so desirable sanction of primitive times, or appeal to the universal sentiment of Christendom in its support. It is neither catholic nor apostolic. In fact it is simply and purely English. This at one time would have been the most cogent reason for its careful preservation amongst Anglicans: now, however, the tables have a little turned, and it would weigh strongly with many for at least treating it with suspicion, if not for decidedly rejecting it. Curious, indeed, is the change which has come over the Anglican Church in this respect! When the Protestant faction was triumphant, the foreign Protestant bodies were regarded with great kindliness by the leaders in that faction, and a good deal of fraternization with Holland, Germany, and Switzerland, with Calvinian and Lutheran sects,

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting while upon the subject of university extension to observe what Archbishop Whately said about it in a letter to Earl Grey written in 1834. 'Every M.A. was originally, and should be now, entitled to demand of the University authorities (unless good cause could be shown against him) a licence to open a hall on his own account; of which there were formerly at Oxford, and I believe at Cambridge, a very great number. It was partly under the reign of Elizabeth, and partly under that of Charles I. that the monopoly was introduced, under which the colleges have, in fact, swallowed up the University.'—*Life of Abp. Whately*, i. p. 227. The reforms since effected have given this relaxation; but how completely it has failed in the few attempts that have been made to act upon it, is known to every one.



was maintained; and English Churchmen took their stand, for the defensive, upon their fidelity to English, as distinct from foreign, views and practices. Now, however, to be English is, in the opinion of many, to be narrow-minded and uncatholic. Consequently, a sentiment which can exhibit no better title to respect than its distinctively English origin, carries its own condemnation with it. It was once the boast of the admirers of the Church of England that her clergy were the most gentlemanly set of ecclesiastics in the world. At the present day the fact is acknowledged with a sigh. Of course we are using the word 'gentleman,' according to the worldly acceptation of the term, as describing a man whose education and manners make him a fit associate for the higher ranks of society, quite irrespective of the dignity he carries as a clergyman. And yet that dignity had something to do with the position which society accorded to its possessor. The clergyman received a cordial reception because he was a clergyman; only the laity, if asked to explain this fact, would have replied that they took it for granted that he was a gentleman likewise. The truth is, the reasons were mixed. Although people did not own to any great reverence for the priestly office as such, because their belief in its powers was dim, and in a technical sense 'low;' yet some such reverence lurked beneath their behaviour to clergymen, and the claims to respect on the score of scholarship and refinement reposed upon this reverence to a greater extent than was acknowledged. The temporalities of the Church had something to do with it also. All clergymen (we are thinking of forty years ago, when curates were, as Mr. Blunt observes in his '*Directorium Pastorale*,' really apprentices who had only a time to serve) would, in the ordinary course of things, become beneficed, and a beneficed clergyman was an important member of society. Moreover, any clergyman might be made a bishop and be called 'My lord;' and these two things together gave the English priest a patent of gentility in the eyes of the world. It is not, indeed, very easy to disentangle the confusion of causes which resulted in the popular notion that a clergyman must be a gentleman; but the above may serve for an attempt.

In passing we may notice how this gentleman-theory has worked to the decided disadvantage of the Church. The notion that a clergyman must needs be a gentleman has operated upon the ambition of the class just below the line of gentility, and made the clerical status desirable to them as at once giving them the footing in society which they had not, but desired to have. We do not say that this ambition has been a primary cause, for that would be unjust to their higher motives, but we have good reason to think that it has often acted as a secondary

cause. When these aspirants to gentility pass into the ministry through the cheap channels of S. Bees and S. Aidan's, and the rest, the awkwardness with which they sustain the newly-acquired character of 'gentleman' is oftentimes distressing, if not amusing, to behold. Their anxiety lest they should commit themselves, or lest the world should not take them to be gentleman, is both ludicrous and painful. Instead of being easy they are bumptious, instead of being modest they are bashful. Their minds are constantly puzzling out the question, What befits a gentleman? Now, if the worldly notion of a gentleman had not attached itself so closely to the idea of an English clergyman, we should not have had the troubles of literates on this head to lament. We think, therefore, that it would be well if this notion were discarded; and, in its stead, let the character of a Christian gentleman, which is the fruit of true gentleness of spirit and humbleness of mind, be exclusively cultivated. No amount of swagger and assumption will gain for a low-bred man the footing of a gentleman; but if a clergyman, who has not had the advantages of birth and liberal education, keep close to his character as a Christian priest in a quiet and unobtrusive way, all people whose opinions are worthy of attention, will accord to him the respect which his office demands, and that is all the respect which a clergyman, be he of high or humble origin, ought to care about.

We next come to the condition of the clergy, which is treated in the Essay on 'Clerical Celibacy.' And here we must say that Mr. Vaux is entitled to the highest praise for the tact and discretion he has manifested in dealing with so delicate a subject—one upon which the feelings, convictions, and prejudices of the English laity are keenly sensitive. He has made out as good a case as it was possible to make, and his article leaves nothing to be desired for learning, temper, and lucid construction. But when we have said this we have said all that can be advanced in his favour. He fails of winning the cause he pleads for. But he fails creditably. The verdict must go against him, through no fault of the advocate, but because the question he has taken in hand has been most completely worked out by a long and varied experience. History has given the answer, and that answer no arguments—from the present exigencies of the Church, from the superior holiness of the virginal state, or from the mind of Catholic antiquity—can overrule.

Mr. Vaux proposes his subject in these terms: 'It is the encouragement of *voluntary* celibacy on the part of the clergy for which I plead.' The word '*voluntary*' is printed in italics, and it well deserves the emphasis which is laid upon it—not however, for the reason which Mr. Vaux would assign, but

because it contains a complete refutation of the whole argument of his essay. In the first place, 'voluntary celibacy' is an expression destitute of meaning as it is used in this essay in respect of the English Church; for it is that and nothing else which the English Church holds and practises, and therefore to plead for it is to plead for what exists already. If this essay were written in the interest of the Roman Church, which enjoins compulsory celibacy, or in the interest of the Russian Church, which enjoins compulsory matrimony, the phrase would be intelligible. As it is, it is simply meaningless. Every unmarried English clergyman is an example of voluntary celibacy, and every married one of voluntary matrimony. In fact, voluntariness is the very principle upon which the English Church has established the condition of her priests. We do not, however, really suppose that Mr. Vaux has taken so much pains, as his essay exhibits, to plead on behalf of a practice which has obtained in all its fulness in the English Church for three centuries, and still flourishes to perfection. He has in view, not the existing practice, but an innovation on the existing practice; only he has made a mistake in using the word 'voluntary' in describing what he desires to bring about. It is really *involuntary* celibacy which he endeavours to establish, and we proceed to prove this assertion. For what does 'voluntary' mean in such a case? Clearly it means the absence of all influence either one way or the other. But is it not the tenour of this article to establish an influence which shall guide the action of the clergy in the direction of the virginal state? If it be not this, then the essay is without aim or purpose. Take the three grounds of reason for celibacy mentioned above, and it will appear that out of each arises a moral force which destroys the voluntariness at once. First, the present exigencies of the Church are put forward as a plea for celibacy. But these exigencies, if they are to operate at all, must do so by compelling the clergy to yield their wills in the matter; and, then, what becomes of their voluntary action? A clergyman would say, justly, 'I am not free to marry, because I am told the welfare of the Church requires that I should remain single.' And let it be borne in mind that if a man is not free to marry, neither is he free to remain single. It is absurd to say that when a man has strong moral pressure brought to bear upon him to prevent his taking one of two roads, he is at perfect liberty to take the other road. His liberty is only perfect when it is equally open to him to take either one road or the other. Again, the superior holiness of the virginal state is propounded. But the moment this is done, the marriage state has a barrier thrown across it which, so far as such an argument can, coerces

freedom of action. Lastly, the mind of Catholic antiquity is asserted to be in favour of celibacy, which is as much as to say that the priest who marries goes against the judgment of that mind. The force of this argument will influence men with different degrees of pressure according to the different degrees of reverence they may entertain for antiquity. But inasmuch as it is assumed to have weight, it cannot be said to leave the wills of the clergy uninfluenced, and when their wills are influenced their voluntariness is destroyed. In short, the fallacy which vitiates the whole of the reasoning of this essay, is the misapprehension of what freedom of will means when viewed in relation to the conduct of a certain class of men as belonging to that class. The argument may be summed up thus: the clergy are bound to shape their lives in such a way as shall best conduce to the interests of the Church: the celibate state of the clergy is more conducive to the interests of the Church than the marriage-state: therefore the clergy are bound to remain celibates. The terms of this argument are perfectly clear; they are distinctly oppugnant to voluntariness; and the essay of Mr. Vaux is neither more nor less than an expansion of this argument. It does not explain it away, but it enforces it. In other words, Mr. Vaux has written an able and ingenious essay to prove that the free-will of the clergy in the matter of their condition, as to whether it should be single or married, ought not to be exercised, but that it ought to be given up for the sake of the Church; and—we repeat the question—when free-will is given up, what becomes of voluntariness? But it may be said in reply, that according to this, laymen oftentimes are not free to marry, because a variety of reasons—prudential and circumstantial—frequently keep those single who would otherwise marry. This argument will not hold good. The analogy upon which it is supposed to stand does not exist. No layman is deterred from marrying because he is a layman: but the clergy are deterred—or, if you please, dissuaded—from marrying because they are clergy. All the reasoning hinges upon this. The interests of the Church are brought home to them as priests of the Church. If this be denied, then the argument proves too much; for it will be just as good in behalf of the celibacy of the laity as of that of the clergy. But this cannot be denied, seeing it is asserted on the very face of the essay. In fact the essay argues from the status of the clergy in the direction of their celibacy, and no one would be so absurd as to argue from the status of the laity in the direction of *their* celibacy.

Let it not, however, be supposed that we are insensible to the countenance which is afforded to the advocates of celibacy

by the occurrence of unhappy facts. When we behold with disgust the silly conduct of a flirting curate, we are provoked at the moment to wish that the English clergy were either under the rule of the Russian Church, which obliges priests to marry, or under the rule of the Roman Church, which obliges them to be celibates. Likewise we can readily acknowledge that a married clergyman, embarrassed with a wife and young family, may find his efficiency hampered thereby in Whitechapel or Bethnal Green. We also allow that a poor clergyman had better not increase the straitness of his circumstances by sharing his penury with a portionless girl, to say nothing of the probable (and in such cases it would almost seem inevitable) half-dozen children. Such instances as these are, indeed, very telling as examples of imprudent marriages, but they have nothing to do with the general question of clerical celibacy. Laymen contract imprudent marriages as well as clergymen, only the imprudence of the cleric is more talked about because, being a sort of public character, his affairs are considered to be public property. A, B, and C are clergymen who have contracted imprudent marriages; D, E, and F are laymen who have done the same: is it reasonable to argue that because A, B, and C have done a foolish thing, therefore the whole body of the clergy should be persuaded to celibacy; and yet that the unwise conduct of D, E, and F is not to be held as of any cogency in ruling the whole body of the laity? But it will be advanced as against this, that the interests of the Church are at stake. We fully admit this, and we only desire that the question may be thoroughly discussed and decided upon the ground of the interests of the Church. Experience furnishes ample evidence to assist in making the decision, and its testimony goes to show that the Church suffers more from clerical celibacy than from the imprudence of clerical marriages. If on the side of marriage folly abounds, on the side of celibacy vice abounds much more: if there be inconvenience arising in isolated cases from clerical marriages, positive evil has but too surely accrued to the Church at large from the system of clerical celibacy. The Church of England had this experience before her eyes when, three hundred years ago, she decided to leave her ministers perfectly free in the matter of marriage. History, notwithstanding the discredit which the one-sidedness or untruthfulness of historians may have cast upon its testimony, deserves a fair hearing in such a matter as this, and our Church has given such a hearing, and upon the evidence thus adduced she rests her decision.

But, while upon this point, we may remark that history does not always obtain an impartial hearing when Church questions are under discussion. Its archives are, indeed, diligently ran-

sacked for arguments to support a foregone conclusion; but an impartial attention to all that it may have to tell concerning a disputed subject is seldom accorded. Historical records are laid under contribution to furnish precedents for the practice of some ritualistic observance, or the use of some curious vestment, but the reasons which those records may assign for the discontinuance of ancient practices and the modification of the ecclesiastical system are too frequently ignored. The student often has to lament the *lacunæ* in ancient documents which the ravages of time, and the carelessness of the ignorant, have produced; but the unbiassed inquirer has equal reason to complain of the wilful oversights the moderns perpetrate in their treatment of the materials which really exist. The judgment of one age has a perfect right to reverse the judgment of a previous age, but only after having carefully listened to the arguments on both sides, certainly not by overlooking what one side has to advance. It is, at least, unreasonable to assume that our forefathers committed an error when the steps by which they reached their conclusion are kept out of sight. The English Reformation, for example, may be found open to objection in certain points, after carefully considering its causes and conditions; but to dismiss it summarily and contemptuously as a huge blunder, which is what many of the mediævalists of our day are so fond of doing, simply disgusts a calm and philosophical mind.

The next question is, how the ministration of the English Church can be most efficiently organized? The essay by Mr. Baring-Gould, 'On the Revival of Religious Confraternities;' that by Mr. Carter, on 'Vows, and their Relation to Religious Communities;' and also that by Mr. Walcott, on 'Cathedral Reform,' all bear upon the subject. They are all full of thought and useful suggestions, and deserve careful and candid study. We strongly recommend them to the reader, while we ourselves pursue, in the remarks we are about to offer, a line of treatment partly parallel to, partly independent on, the arguments of the Essayists.

We are not of those who never speak of the English Reformation but in words of disparagement; who regard it as a blunder, if not a crime; and who feel bound to disclaim all sympathy with its promoters when reference is made to it by our brethren of the Roman obedience. We are, on the contrary, inclined to the opinion expressed by the Dean of Ely, when he presented to the Lower House of Convocation the report of the committee on Ritual, that the Reformation was no blunder, but a blessing, and if it were not a blessing it was a crime. There is, however, one part of the work perpetrated at the time of the Reformation, and which thick-and-thin Protestants delight to dwell upon as



the most satisfactory achievement of it, but which we, as Churchmen, can only contemplate with feelings of indignation and regret. We mean the dissolution of the monasteries, and the abolition of the religious orders. To call that a reform is to call things by their wrong names. It was not reformation, it was destruction; it was not improvement, it was rapine; its actuating motive was not the good of the Church, but plunder. That the monastic institutions had become too numerous, had grown too rich, had sunk into much sloth and occasional immorality, no candid reader of history will deny. For ourselves, we feel convinced that their general condition, with only such exceptions as were too few and insignificant to call for special notice, cried out loudly for some measures of re-construction. But robbery is not a synonym for such measures. When a man falls down in the street in a fit, it is necessary to loosen his neck-cloth, and open his waistcoat: but he who renders these services in order to appropriate the breast-pin and the watch, is a common thief. We have always thought that the kind attentions which the Church of England received in respect of her monastic corporations, were on a level with those of the said thief; and we have spoken of the dissolution of the monasteries as a work perpetrated at the time of the Reformation, because we cannot bring ourselves to think of it as part of that movement which we believe to have been divinely ordered for the good of our Church.

The immediate consequence of the abolition of the religious orders was to leave the Church destitute of all co-operative agencies for the spiritual and benevolent care of the poor and ignorant. The unceasing necessity of home-missions was not then understood. The idea which prevailed then, and which continued down to our own times, but which, happily, is almost, if not quite dispelled now, was that a people does not need evangelization when it has become professedly Christian, and its national religion is that of the Cross. The fact of there being multitudes of heathen in the midst of a Christian population, was not even suspected. The difficulties of the Church were supposed to be chiefly political, and only so far doctrinal as doctrine hangs on the skirts of politics in a state religion. The fact of practical heathenism being a chronic condition of a Christian country, flashed upon Wesley, and Wesley flashed upon the Church, but the Church was too sound asleep to be suddenly awoken by his or any other light. The fact has been gradually dawning upon her since, and now is nearly at noon-tide brightness. We now know that the evangelization of the people can never be looked upon as a *fait accompli*, but is a perpetual, though varying circumstance of a professedly Christian country; varying, partly through the

variableness of the energy with which home-mission work is carried on, and partly through the unequal progress of population and material prosperity. Scripture-readers, city missionaries, lay-readers, Bible-women, sisters of charity, are so many desultory efforts made by the Church of England in feeling her way towards meeting the wants, the existence of which she is only just now fully alive to. While the necessity of some organization, supplemental to the ordinary parochial system, is felt and practically acknowledged by such efforts as those just enumerated, it is but natural that longing looks should be cast back to the period when the monastic system existed, and furnished an inexhaustible supply of the assistance now so much wanted. The circumstances of spoliation with which the abolition of that system was accompanied, give colour to the arguments of those who can see nothing but good in the system itself, and are for restoring it in its integrity. The suppression of the monasteries has so much the appearance of 'looting,' as to throw discredit upon the otherwise obvious fact, that it was better that the monasteries, being as they were, should be suppressed. The ugly facts of history, in this case, give an impact to the proclivities of mediævalists.

On the other hand, the need of some organization more distinctly ecclesiastical than any that have yet been attempted is strongly felt by those who have tried the various agencies we have mentioned above, and have experienced their defects. Our Evangelical friends know well enough the troubles in which a parish priest may be involved by the bigotry or conceit of a self-willed Scripture-reader. In such cases episcopal authority is greatly desired, and the chastening influence of religious association, in which individuality is lost in the corporate existence, would have prevented all the mischief. The inconveniences which beset the existing agencies seem to point in one direction for their remedy,—in the direction, namely, of religious association, whether of men or women. For all the defects which obstruct their working are traceable to two causes; the one is the undue prominence given to the individual, which allows self-will and conceit to have sway; the other is the low Church level on which these efforts take their stand, being regarded for the most part as having to do with Christianity in general, and no form of it in particular. In order to avoid these evils, and also to escape those which experience has shown to lie on the opposite side, great discretion will be needed in constructing a system upon which such associations may be organized. There are two cries set up by the advocates of the revival of confraternities which should be received with distrust in proportion to their enthusiasm. On the one hand, it is de-

clared that the parochial system of the Church of England has broken down, so far as reaching the masses in large towns is concerned. This is not strictly true. The parochial system is more efficient now than at any other period of its history; only it does not do now, any more than it ever did, what it never could do, and never was intended to do. Parochial work is not mission work; and we have pointed out that mission work, though differing in kind, is just as constantly needed in a Christian country as parochial work. Let this be distinctly understood, and then it will be seen that it is not the failure of the parochial system which has to be deplored, but the abolition at the Reformation of the mission system which was carried on by the religious orders; and that the true remedy is the establishment of a mission system which shall work side by side with the parochial system, depending upon it, subordinate to it, but still separately organized. Here, on the other hand, we must caution against another error. If it be granted that religious confraternities are needful for home mission work, it must not be hastily concluded that they should be merely a revival of the confraternities which existed before the Reformation. On this point we reiterate our previous remark that history ought to be read impartially, and its evidence fully and candidly sifted; and if this be done, the result will show that the pre-Reformation confraternities did a vast amount of mischief by their jealousy of the parochial clergy and their incessant encroachments upon the parochial system. What is desiderated is a cordial co-operation of the mission system with the parochial system; but history almost entirely witnesses to the rivalries and collisions which took place between the two, fostered too often by the bishops, who sought to play off the regulars against the seculars. We do not say that precisely this form of evil is likely to recur; but human nature is a constant quantity in all such combinations, and will certainly throw up mischiefs of some kind or other, unless judicious provision be made to repress them. How this is to be done is the problem of the day, and a good deal has been contributed towards its solution by the writers in the present volume.

The next group of essays that awaits notice is that which may be called the philosophico-theological group. We can, in the space of this article, do scarcely more than name them, and pass on. No. 10 is on 'Positivism,' by the Rev. J. Gregory Smith, and is a very able criticism on the rising philosophy of Antichrist; No. 11 is entitled, 'Revelation and Science: Two Interpreters of the Will of God.' It bears no name, for which the reason assigned by the Editor is reasonable, namely, 'that on the neutral ground between "Revelation and Science," the position assumed

'should be lost or won in virtue of the inherent weakness or 'strength of the arguments employed, independently of any 'influence arising from the author's name.' From this we gather that the author's name is influential; and the essay bears internal evidence of power which would make the writer of it respected. The sixteenth article is on 'Science and Prayer,' by the Rev. Malcolm MacColl, and it treats the subject with special reference to the discussion which Professor Tyndall raised in the columns of the *Pall Mall Gazette* on the occasion of the issue of the cattle-plague prayer. There is one merit which all these essays share in common, and that is the calm and judicious tone in which they carry on their discussions. The writers show themselves to be philosophers as well as theologians. They are not alarmists. They do not condescend to denounce, being well satisfied with their ability to refute; and where refutation is not possible within the present limits of knowledge, their faith in the Eternal Wisdom gives them patience to wait for more light. We transcribe from the conclusion of the eleventh article this nobly philosophical, as well as devoutly theological, adjustment of the relative positions of Revelation and Science; and commend its description of the proper attitude which the Churchman should maintain towards them.

"The Churchman will be content to wait patiently, weighing, correcting, proving his own judgment, as travellers in a new country correct their impressions of the form of the objects around them, and the relative bearings of the mountain peaks, as the grey light of morning clears and brightens into the perfect day. Accepting Revelation as an infallible record of the Divine Will, he will own that this too has come down to us through the instrumentality of human agencies; without an interpreter as infallible as itself on questions of physical science, and its meaning thereon; and with a mixture of the element of human fallibility of necessity absorbed into it, as it comes into his hand through the inevitable processes of translation, of copying, of interpretation. Accepting Science as a commissioned, though fallible interpreter of the works of God, he will be ready, while he examines its conclusions with a rigid scrutiny, to receive them with a certain reverence and reasonable submission; he will be thankful for them when they give him a clearer insight into the meaning of the Word, when they enable him to discern little errors which have crept into the record itself, or into its interpretation; when they enable him to separate clearly the opinion of men about revelation from that which is indeed revealed.

"Thus, not in hasty fear or trembling, lest some coming storm, surging up from some unexpected quarter, should prove that the edifice of his hope is built upon the sand, will he look upon the progress of advancing science, and listen to the dim sounds and faint murmurs borne to him out of the dark future. He will wait, as he might wait upon the bosom of some vast lake which he knows to be the source of a mighty river, even though he cannot tell the exact boundaries of the lake itself, or the outlet whence the river flows. Yet he will wait patiently, knowing that his comrades, toiling upwards from the river's mouth, must eventually arrive at the same goal which he himself has found, and nothing doubting, though their white sails in the distance, following the river-course, seem sometimes bending in directions varying from, nay, even

opposite to, the point where he himself awaits them. In patience he will wait, in patience possessing his soul, welcoming every stray beam of light, every detached fragment of truth, as undoubtedly indications of the presence of the God of Light and Truth, though he cannot as yet recognise the place of the one in the mighty edifice, or trace the other to the point at which it issued out of the splendours of the dawn. In patience he will wait, knowing that all voices which utter portions of the truth, though they seem to sound in discord now, will fall into their place in the great harmony wherewith perfect truth shall be declared to men, that all true interpretations differing, now, as men look on different sides and different aspects of the truth, shall speak with one voice, in the day when neither God's works nor God's words shall be needed to declare Him to His faithful ones, for, as they know assuredly, they shall "see Him as He is."—*The Church and the World*, p. 294.

We now come to the last group of articles. They are three in number, and may properly be ranged under the title, 'Ritualism.' The first article is No. 2, on 'The Missionary Aspect of Ritualism,' by Dr. Littledale; the second is No. 17, on 'The Reasonable Limits of Lawful Ritualism,' by Mr. Perry; the third is the last article in the volume, and is headed, 'The Liturgies of 1549 and 1662, contrasted and compared by the Editor.' It is but common candour to say that these three gentlemen have treated the different aspects of what they are content to call 'Ritualism' which they have respectively undertaken, with ability, clearness, and good taste, excepting, as regards the last particular, the questionable illustration Dr. Littledale draws from the coarse and glaring attractions of the gin-palace to point out the advantage of colour, lights, and music in divine worship as influencing the poor and ignorant. What Mr. Perry may have to say respecting the legal view of the question is entitled to a respectful hearing, for he undoubtedly possesses a large amount of well-digested knowledge on the subject, and this fact has only been brought out into stronger relief by his controversy with Mr. Shaw, the writer in the *Contemporary Review*; and, having in mind the vulgar vehemence and unchristianly bitterness with which the cause of Ritualism is pushed and contested in certain quarters, the calm and courteous spirit of these two disputants is refreshing. But with regard to the legal question itself it is quite clear that by no amount of general discussion, how judiciously and temperately so ever it may be conducted, can it finally be settled. It is certainly a great advantage to have the case fully set out and thoroughly sifted in the most public manner, and though we are by no means content with some of the means employed, yet such a mass of opinion, such an accumulation of evidence, as this free-handling of the subject produces, must have its value in preparing the way for a decision which shall rest upon sound principles, and be the result of comprehensive knowledge. But a valid decision must proceed from a court of law, composed of judges who do not go to

the consideration of the question with opinions or prejudices already formed. Common-sense, that quasi-judicial influence to which Englishmen are so fond of appealing, is weakest in the present case. When, indeed, such matters as surpliced-choirs, choral-services, the surplice in the pulpit, the rubrical use of the Church-Militant Prayer, were in question, common-sense was perfectly competent to deal with them, for there was little legal difficulty involved; it was chiefly a matter of clerical tact and discretion as applied to each particular instance in which their introduction was sought. But in spite of the confidence with which Ritualists assert the obligation of the much-discussed rubric before 'the Order of Morning and Evening Prayer' to be equally clear and positive with that of the other rubrics, the stubborn testimony of facts contradicts them. Whatever its meaning may be, its obligation is not as positive. For some time, and up to this moment, well-informed and unprejudiced men have been at issue upon this question, and it is absurd to affect to treat a matter as beyond doubt when it is notoriously the most doubtful matter now before the Church—that is to say, a matter concerning which the most lively disputations are being carried on in every possible way.

It is quite true that the general practice of the English Church—such is the plasticity of public opinion in these modern times—can undergo very considerable modifications in regard of worship without judicial interference either furthering or checking; and a village church may have its ritual peaceably raised to the level of the cathedral standard. But then the very fact of there being a standard in the cathedral to which the rural service can be worked up, clears the ground of legal obstacles, leaving only the difficulties ordinarily besetting the change of local practices. But the Ritualists, in respect for example of incense, are absolutely destitute of any such standard. Incense is as unknown in cathedrals as it is in parish churches; and its introduction involves a change of a much more violent and novel character than any that could be effected by suddenly substituting a full-blown cathedral service for a slovenly parson-and-clerk duet in a small country church. No instance has been produced of a chasuble being worn till the last few years, and it is natural that many persons would desire that resort should be had to the legal tribunals to search into the subject and declare what the law is concerning it; and Churchmen of all shades of opinion will do wisely in looking this contingency in the face, and awaiting its possible approach with frankness and composure.

We call attention to this point for two reasons. In the first



place because we have observed with considerable surprise that some Ritualists seem to take for granted that the changes they are seeking to make can for a certainty be introduced without a legal battle; as though a chasuble or a censer were not more remarkable in the Church of England than a surpliced choir or a pair of candlesticks. In the next place, because we think that the dislike of legal interference in Church questions may be carried to an unreasonable extent. We, indeed, quite sympathize with the feeling which possesses all true friends of the Church, that litigation in ecclesiastical matters is *primâ facie* an evil, and that all rash and wanton provocation of such measures is to be deprecated. At the same time circumstances may arise which may render litigation a wholesome necessity. Such circumstances may arise in respect of 'Ritualism.' We are not of those who desire to see the Church of England lose her character for reasonable comprehensiveness, but the present state of things certainly exhibits the extreme limit of comprehensiveness. S. Alban's, Holborn, on the one hand, and S. Mary's, Islington, on the other, do not witness to the liberty, but to the exuberance of self-seeking into which Church government has run. Where the fault lies, is another question; what the true remedy is we are not concerned to say; but the fact itself is indisputable; and the consequence,—legal proceedings,—is, we fear, but too probable; and because it is too probable, we desire to prepare the minds of Churchmen for it, so that they may meet it with all the advantages of clear foresight, calm judgment, and candid temper.

But besides legal action, there is another contingency, by no means so improbable, for which it is as well to be prepared, namely, legislative enactment. If the ultimate court decides that Ritualism in its most advanced form is not illegal in the Church of England, then we must expect vigorous efforts to be made to alter the law so as to make it illegal. What the decision of the court may be it is but waste of time to discuss; but it may at least be observed, that if the same latitudinizing temper with a little more fairness prevail which ruled the decision of the Privy Council in the 'Essays and Reviews' case, then we cannot see how a judgment of acquittal can be withheld from the Ritualists. It only needs that the rubrics should receive the same treatment as the articles. We know what the alarmist and the partizan would say then. The one will exclaim, Do not alter the law, for the Church of England cannot stand it; the other will cry out, If the law be altered, the effect will be a schism. Both outcries amount to the same thing, namely, that the Church of England cannot stand the strain of fresh legislation. Against this opinion there lies of course the protest, that it implies want of faith in the Anglican Church. If a body

be so weak in its constitution that it is unable to bear up under the measures taken to repair and strengthen it, then people will add it is clearly moribund, and must in the end perish. But this opinion no faithful son of the Church will suffer himself to entertain; and to all the sons of the Church the word of counsel is, 'Be not faithless.' Such, at least, is the thought which at first arises in the mind of a loyal Churchman, when signs of timidity, and distrust, and evil-foreboding show themselves in others. But the recollection of what legislation in Church matters involves in the present condition of political parties, and with the House of Commons composed of such a motley crew, that the third collect for Good Friday would be a more suitable 'Prayer for the High Court of Parliament' than that which is at present in use,—this recollection causes him to start back in horror from the thought of the holy things of the Church being subjected even to the discussion of so profane an assembly, to say nothing of their being ruled by their incompetent and unchristian judgment; and the cool proposition that a short declaratory Act should be passed for the purpose of meeting the difficulties of the present crisis cannot be received without a shudder. Happily Parliament seems to be aware of its own unfitness to deal with questions which affect the doctrine or discipline of the Church, and to perceive the incongruity of 'Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics' coercing by their legislation, in a professedly free country, the belief and practices of a Christian communion. But this reluctance may give way to the persistent efforts of the Protestant sections, and if it do give way, then the consequences which may follow may well cause the extreme Ritualists to pause and reflect upon their position, and take thought how far loyalty to the Church of England, as well as love for the Church Catholic, with both of which sentiments we gladly believe them to be inspired, demand a re-consideration of the whole subject. It is, indeed,—we freely acknowledge it,—a thankless task to say any words, but words of sympathy and praise, to men who so manfully and self-denyingly grapple with sin in its most loathsome haunts, and minister to the sick and needy with a devotion which loves to imitate the example of their Divine Master. The impulse of every generous heart is to 'esteem them very highly in love for their works' sake." May that impulse receive no check, albeit the unhappy exigencies of the time call for criticism upon their conduct.

Before quitting the subject of Ritual, we would speak about that aspect of it for which the unionists claim special attention. The ritual movement, it is asserted, is bound up very closely with the movement for the re-union of Christendom. Now it is

fairly open to question how far uniformity in externals is necessary, or even useful, to the great purpose of unity in the faith. That such uniformity was not insisted on in ancient times, and did not obtain in the middle ages, is clear from history. The widest latitude was tolerated in non-essentials, always premising that the variations in ritual revolved round the grand central doctrines of the Church, and consequently were consistent with its catholicity. The shape of vestments, the sequence of colours, the number and position and character of the minor observances in ceremonial, varied indefinitely. There were national, provincial, and even diocesan 'uses,' distinguished by their respective peculiarities. The papacy first moved in the direction of uniformity, and our own Act of Uniformity was only a Protestant imitation, in respect of our own Church, of the attempts which the popes had more and more encroachingly made to fashion all the churches upon the Roman model. Thus the desire to see 'Ceremonies in all places one and utterly like,' finds less and less encouragement the further we go back in the history of the Church. But let it not be supposed that this variety of ritual is evidence of caprice, or that it favours the idea that the rubrical directions of the Church may be disregarded at pleasure. Though the 'uses' were very numerous, yet each one of them was authorized. Their variety gives no countenance to the chaotic state of ritual which, at the present day, justifies the remark that the Church of England is a heterogeneous mass of congregationalism. Each 'use,' though it may have obtained only in one nation, or in one province, or even no further than the limits of one diocese, yet was imposed by the authority ruling within that sphere, and was fully obeyed by all who were obliged by it. Individual priests did not take or leave portions of the ritual as it pleased them. Consequently there existed, in spite of the great variety of 'uses,' no such anomalous state of things as that exhibited by the Church of England, which professes to have but one 'use' throughout her obedience, and yet the actual modes of celebrating divine service are almost as multitudinous as the buildings in which it is celebrated. Thus it appears that while, on the one hand, catholic unity does not in the least involve ritualistic uniformity, on the other hand, the voice of antiquity condemns the capricious tampering with the 'use' which a priest professes to be guided by. Viewing the whole question of ritual in its connexion with Catholic unity, we are reminded of the words which the Bishop of Vermont has placed as the motto on the title-page of his recent work: '*In necessariis unitas; in non necessariis libertas; in omnibus caritas.*'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'The Law of Ritualism examined in its relation to the Word of God, to the

Here we must break off the chain of remarks which have been suggested by, rather than applied to, this book, 'The Church and the World.' The repetition of its title reminds us of the exception which some critics have taken to it. For our own part, we find no fault with the title. On the contrary, it appears to us to be both appropriate, and pregnant with useful thought. The juxtaposition of these two words, 'Church' and 'World' is profoundly suggestive of reflections which all Christian men will do wisely to cherish in these times. For it reminds us of the real contest which is going on beneath the surface agitations of the hour: the contest between good and evil, between grace and nature, between the unseen and the seen, between the temporal and eternal, between holiness and sin; and it brings up in the memory the voice of our Divine Master, so full of power and of love to still the tempest of our troubled mind, 'If the world hate you, ye know that it hated Me before it hated you.'<sup>1</sup> Moreover it points out what the real mission of the Church, and consequently the grand work of Churchmen, is, namely to spread the everlasting Gospel throughout the world, so that its saving truth may penetrate its every part, regenerating, sanctifying, elevating it, until the trumpet of 'the seventh angel' sounds forth, and the 'great voices in heaven' proclaim, 'the kingdoms of this world are become 'the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall 'reign for ever and ever.'<sup>2</sup>

#### NOTE.

Since this article was begun a second edition of 'the Church and the World' has appeared. It is merely a reprint of the first edition, with an appendix containing a few notes to three of the essays, not in any way affecting the arguments and opinions propounded in the original work; and extracts from the reviews which had then been passed upon it.

---

Primitive Church, to the Church of England, and to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, by the Right Rev. John Henry Hopkins, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Vermont, New York, 1866,' is the title of a book in many ways remarkable. Bishop Hopkins, the 'Presiding Bishop,' is seventy-five years of age, and yet, at the request of the clergy of the American Church, he takes up and handles in a spirit of the most perfect candour, and with a fresh and lively interest, the subject of ritualism. He is a zealous protester against, and has been an active controvertor of, Romish errors, and yet he speaks with the warmest approbation of the revival of a splendid ritual.

<sup>1</sup> S. John xv. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Revelation xi. 15

ART. V.—1. *The Pope and the Revolution*. A Sermon preached in the Oratory Church, Birmingham, on Sunday, October 7th, 1866. By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D.D. London: Longmans. 1866.

2. *Revue des deux Mondes*. Paris.

3. *Annuaire des deux Mondes*. Tomes I.—XIII. (1850–1865). Paris: Bureau de la 'Revue des deux Mondes.'

4. *Degli ultimi Casi di Romagna*. Riflessioni di MASSIMO D'AZEGLIO. Italia. 1846.

5. *La Politique et le Droit chrétien au point de Vue de la Question Italienne*. Par MASSIMO D'AZEGLIO. Troisième édition. Paris: Dentu. 1860.

6. *Sul Dominio Temporale dei Papi*. Considerazioni di G. B. GIORGINI. Firenze: Barbèra. 1859.

7. *Il Clero e la Società, ossia della Riforma della Chiesa*. Per FILIPPO PERFETTI. Firenze: Barbèra. 1862.

8. *La Questione della Indipendenza ed Unità d'Italia dinanzi al Clero*. Per ERNESTO FILALETE [Carlo Passaglia?]. Firenze: Le Monnier. 1861.

9. *All' Illustre Passaglia Lettera di Girolamo Bobone, dell' Ordine dei Predicatori, già Professore di Teologia Dogmatica à Roma, ora di Sacra Scrittura nella Regia Università di Siena*. Firenze: Barbèra. 1861.

10. *La Curia Romana ei Gesuiti*. Nuovi Scritti del Cardinale DE ANDREA, di Monsignor F. LIVERANI, e del Canonico E. REALI. Firenze: Barbèra. 1861.

11. *La Chiesa e lo Stato in Italia*. Studi del Cav. CARLO BONCOMPAGNI, Deputato al Parlamento, Ministro Plenipotenziario di S. M. il Re d'Italia. Firenze: Successori Le Monnier. 1866.

THERE are questions which admit both of an abstract and of an historical treatment: there are others wherein one of these two methods of discussion must needs predominate. In attempting to arrive at any conclusion respecting the advantage or disadvantage of the union of spiritual and temporal power in a single hand, historic investigation must, if we are not mistaken, necessarily occupy the higher place. For it seems impossible to prove, on anything like *à priori* grounds, that such union is necessarily good or necessarily bad: the times and circumstances must be

taken into account, and each case be judged mainly, if not exclusively, with reference to itself alone.

In patriarchal times, the first-born seems to have enjoyed the rights of the throne, the priesthood, and the double portion. Melchizedek is at once *king* of Salem and *priest* of the most high God. Even heathendom, in various ways, recognised some mystic connexion between the *regale* and the *pontificate*. Athens had its special Archon, the *ἀρχων βασιλεύς*, and Rome its *rex sacrificulus*, to offer sacrifices which even these republics conceived to come with special fitness from a king alone. Virgil, when he would recall the features of antiquity, introduces his readers to a royal priest of Apollo:

‘Rex Anius, rex idem hominum Phœbique sacerdos’:<sup>1</sup>

and Cicero had previously represented divination as a kingly office. ‘Omnino apud veteres, qui rerum potiebantur, iidem auguria tenebant. Ut enim sapere, sic *divinare regale ducebant*, ut testis est nostra civitas, quâ et in *Reges augures*, et postea ‘privati.’” The Chinese Empire, which especially claims to be patriarchal—and some learned men, as Windischmann, have supported the claim—regards its ruler as one who combines priestly with regal functions. Mahomet, also, who looked more to the elder than to the Christian dispensation as a rule for guidance, left spiritual as well as secular duties to be exercised by succeeding caliphs. The Llama of Thibet affords another illustration of the same conjunction.

But at an early period in the history of the chosen race, this union was destined to be interrupted. It is true that the king and the *prophet* are united in the person of David; but no one man is king and *priest* between the time of Moses and of the latest of those seers who foretold of Him who alone of our race is at once Prophet, Priest, and King. Nor does this severance appear the less divinely sanctioned because it had its origin from the sins of Reuben, and of Simeon and Levi. Evil does not cease to be evil in itself; but in many instances, and this is a striking one, God overrules it to good. Levi by his zeal regains the priesthood; but the double portion is assigned to Joseph, and the royalty alone descends to Judah.<sup>2</sup> In some respects the monarchy seems to have had the superiority; as is seen in the case of the deposition of Abiathar in favour of Zadok by King Solomon. But when a king would usurp the functions of the

<sup>1</sup> Æn. iii. 80.

<sup>2</sup> De Divinatione, lib. i. cap. 40.

<sup>3</sup> Compare Genesis xlix. 3—12, and xlviii. 22, with Exodus xxxiii. 26—28, Deuteronomy xxxiii. 8—11, and 1 Chronicles v. 1, 2. The election of Simon Maccabeus to be prince and high-priest in b.c. 141 was irregular, inasmuch as his family was neither of the house of David nor the house of Aaron.



priesthood and offer sacrifice or incense, he is rebuked, and the sin is divinely punished.<sup>1</sup> Thus did each power in turn restrain the other; and a devout and able commentator<sup>2</sup> may be right in interpreting the two golden pipes seen by Zechariah as God's two ordinary channels of good to His people; the anointed priest and the anointed king.

For the first three centuries of Christianity, no terms of alliance between the Church and State were possible. The Roman Empire seldom tolerated Christianity, and ten times fiercely persecuted it. The conversion of Constantine altered this state of things. There have been those who, looking back on the extraordinary graces displayed by the exprimitive Christians, have doubted whether this new phase of affairs was a blessing. We cannot follow them. They seem to us too apt to forget the misery of a condition wherein heroic virtue could alone hope to endure; wherein for Christians nothing was secure: they seem to ignore the torture of mind, as well as of body inflicted by these constant persecutions; the distressing difficulties connected with the restoration of the lapsed; the impossibility of progress in at least some directions of thought and action. Without the planting of the Cross on the imperial diadem, there could never have been that leavening of the wealth of the Egypt, that sanctification of the powers of the human intellect which actually took place in God's Church, when the sons of them that had afflicted her came bending unto her; when kings became her nursing fathers and queens her nursing mothers. A single instance of this operation may suffice. It is surely most striking to see at the head of the famous Epitome of Roman Law, the Institutes of Justinian, the inscription, '*In nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi*;' to perceive how the fairest ideal of justice, that human reason, before the Gospel came, had ever dreamt of,<sup>3</sup> was taken under the fostering wing of the Church, and by it purified and elevated, not destroyed.

In proportion as the Church drew to herself the intellect of society, as her missionaries became pioneers of civilization, and her prelates the most cultivated men of their age, it was natural that sovereigns should seek assistance from ecclesiastics in various departments of government. Transactions which involve a knowledge of reading and writing can only be carried on through the medium of persons acquainted with those useful arts: and in ages when the terms 'good clerk' (*bonus clericus*, *beau-clerc*) and 'good scholar' were synonymous; when a noble, as a poet justly represents, would exult in the ignorance of his lay-sons; chancellors,

<sup>1</sup> 1 Kings ii. 26, 27; 2 Chronicles xxvi. 16—20.

<sup>2</sup> Hengstenberg on Zechariah iv. 12—14.

<sup>3</sup> De Broglie.

justiciaries, prime ministers must needs have been sought among the clergy. Hume, of course, and his followers have at hand the words 'priestcraft,' 'ambition,' and the like, as an obvious and easy solution of this phenomenon of the Middle Ages; and even Sismondi is not quite exempt from the imputation of the lower motives only. Gibbon is, in this respect, more just; and in our own time, since the Peace of 1815, there has arisen a school of historians in which the names of Guizot, Michelet, Hallam, Palgrave, Mill, and others stand conspicuous,—a school which has torn to very shreds the shallow and uncharitable theories of the eighteenth century, and recognizes in many an ecclesiastic-statesman, in many a prince-bishop, true lovers of liberty and order; men who may be justly believed to have been 'dear to God,' as well as 'famous to all ages.'

One such only shall be mentioned here, as a type and specimen of many of his kind. We know not where, in the earlier portion of the fifteenth century, the eye can light on a more noble and prepossessing figure than that of the first Scottish statesman of his day, Kennedy, Bishop of S. Andrews, in the reign of James III. Royal by descent, and more than royal by his gifts of head and heart; pious, munificent, zealous for the interests of literature and science; frugal in his household, bountiful in all that related to the worship of God or the public works of the State; a reformer of abuses, a conservative in all things good; firm, able, and upright—he was indeed a *parens patriæ*.<sup>1</sup>

But it cannot be disguised that there was another side to this conjunction. All prelates are not such as that holy Bishop of S. Andrews. Earthly dignity and power may become great snares. If there were sovereigns who claimed to be as a *persona mixta*,<sup>2</sup> with certain rights reserved to them in the very sanctuary, there were prelates in the Middle Ages, as more recently in the eighteenth century, who forgot their sacred duties amidst the incumbrances of worldly state. We may have occasion to appeal on this subject to the language of historians, as the Abbé Fleury. For the moment we will only cite the well-known passage of the first great and enduring work of modern literature.

'Rome, that turn'd the world to good,  
Was wont to boast two suns, whose several beams  
Cast light on either way—the world's and God's.  
One since has quench'd the other; and the sword  
Is grafted on the crook; and so conjoin'd,  
Each must perforce decline to worse, unawed  
By fear of other.'

<sup>1</sup> See Tytler, *History of Scotland*, vol. iv. p. 174. Bishop Kennedy died on May 10th, A.D. 1466.

<sup>2</sup> Chéruel, *Dictionnaire Historique*, Art. Roi. (Paris: Hachette.) 1855.

'The Church of Rome,  
Mixing two governments that ill assort,  
Hath miss'd her footing, fallen into the mire,  
And there herself and burden much defiled.'<sup>1</sup>

This, then, is, we repeat, a subject where it seems impossible to lay down any precise rule. Union of spiritual and temporal authority cannot possibly be wrong, immoral, or irreligious; for it has been sanctioned by God himself. Those who, like Melchizedek, have borne it, are moreover types of the great Head of our race. Severance between these same powers must be equally blameless; for that, too, received the Divine blessing and sanction in the history of the chosen race. From the union innumerable blessings have accrued to humanity; more, probably, than most of us are aware of, for they are not always obvious to the sight: some not inconsiderable evils have likewise arisen, and the general tendency of events has for some centuries been towards separation. To measure the proportion of good and evil is a task which probably exceeds human powers, nor can any opinion upon the subject be considered to enter into the region of dogma.

Consequently, the *Christian Remembrancer* must again claim the right of allowing some latitude of thought and expression to its contributors upon such a theme. If between this paper and any which may have preceded or shall follow it, a certain slight measure of divergence be visible, we shall not be at pains to conceal it. We proceed, at present, to name some of these arguments in favour of the temporal power of the Papacy, which seem, at any rate to the present writer, to have most weight.

Let us, firstly, look at the opposite scheme, at the case where no hierarchy is recognized by the State. We know something of such countries; and we believe it to be a most serious evil in a social, in a political, above all in a religious point of view. People talk glibly of apostolic poverty. They ought not to forget that the great Head of the Church bestowed on His apostles the power of working miracles; a power which at once does away with the necessity of many other means of influence.

1

'Soleva Roma, che 'l mondo buonfeco,  
Due Soli aver, che l'una e l'altra strada  
Facean vedere, e del mondo, e di Deo.  
L'un l'altro ha spento, ed è giunta la spada  
Col pastorale, e l'un coll'altro insieme  
Per viva forza mal convien che vada;  
Perocchè giunti, l'un l'altro non teme.

Di oggimai che la Chiesa di Roma  
Per confondere in sè duo reggimenti,  
Cade nel fango, e sè brutta e la roma.'

Dante, *Purgatorio*, Cant. xvi.

The above translation is that of Cary.

Moreover it is by no means clear that a condition of things which befits the commencement of a dispensation is, necessarily, the most suitable for its continuance. In the case of all but saints, men are much more influenced by secondary considerations than they are apt to acknowledge even to themselves. 'In Egypt the state of God's people was servitude; and therefore His service was accordingly. In the desert they had no sooner aught of their own, but a tabernacle is required; and in the land of a Canaan a temple.'<sup>1</sup> As in the material fabric, even so in the persons of Christ's ministry. Unless due honour be paid to them, contempt of religion itself is but too likely to follow. Bishop Berkeley would fain have seen a graduated service of the clergy; brethren, we presume, specially marked out for the poor, rectors facing squires, bishops with the barons, archbishops with princes. In so far as this theory is realized by the actual condition of the English hierarchy, it also enjoys likewise the countenance of Edmund Burke.

'As the mass of any description of men are but men, and their poverty cannot be voluntary, that disrespect which attends upon all Lay poverty will not depart from the Ecclesiastical. Our provident constitution has therefore taken care that those who are to instruct presumptuous ignorance, those who are to be censors over insolent vice, should neither incur their contempt, nor live upon their alms; nor will it tempt the rich to a neglect of the true medicine of their minds. For these reasons, whilst we provide first for the poor, and with a parental solicitude, we have not relegated religion (like something we were ashamed to show) to obscure municipalities or rustic villages. No! We will have her to exalt her mitred front in courts and parliaments. We will have her mixed throughout the whole mass of life, and blended with all the classes of society. The people of England will show to the haughty potentates of the world, and to their talking sophisters, that a free, a generous, an informed nation, honours the high magistrates of its Church; that it will not suffer the insolence of wealth and titles, or any other species of proud pretension, to look down with scorn upon what they look up to with reverence, nor presume to trample on that acquired personal nobility, which they intend always to be, and which often is, the fruit, not the reward, (for what can be the reward?), of learning, piety, and virtue. They can see, without pain or grudging, an Archbishop precede a Duke.'<sup>2</sup>

It may fairly deserve consideration, whether these arguments do, by parity of reasoning, make in favour of a position for at least one bishop, which shall place him on a level with sovereigns; whether, waiving for the moment all question of doctrines, there may not be at least a plausible case made out in favour of the authority thus gained for religion; whether kings and nobles may not listen the more to the voice of an equal than of an inferior. In the time of Hooker there were in Europe several prince-bishops, and his language concerning the obedience due to them is singularly emphatic. 'With men of skill and mature judg-

<sup>1</sup> Hooker.<sup>2</sup> Reflections on the French Revolution.

'ment there is of this so little doubt, that concerning such as at this day are under the archbishops of Mayence, Cologne, and Treves, being both archbishops and princes of the Empire,—yea, such as live within the Pope's own civil territories,—there is no cause why any should deny to yield them civil obedience in anything which they command, not repugnant to Christian piety; yea, even that civilly for such as are under them not to obey them, were but the part of seditious persons.'<sup>1</sup> The tone of the Protestant historian and statesman, M. Guizot, in our day, is equally decided. Indeed, his defence of the papal temporalities is one of the ablest extant.

At this point, then, the following may be submitted to the judgment of the reader as probable propositions:—

1. That the temporal sway of a Christian bishop is not in itself a thing necessarily immoral or irreligious.

2. That, this being the case, it must be fair to defend such rule, by all lawful means, against extraneous attacks.

3. That prayer offered to God for the continuance of what the suppliants deem to be, at least indirectly, a means of spiritual blessing, has that claim to respect which is due to its own exceeding sacredness, even from those who may think the object of such prayer a mistaken one.

4. That, nevertheless, the temporal government of any ruler,—king, emperor, bishop, president,—must be judged in and by itself as a temporal government, with reference to the ends and objects of such government: and that the same rules must be applicable to it as are applied to other governments by the general conscience of Christendom.

It is, of course, in connexion with the fourth and last of these propositions that differences between ourselves and Dr. Newman are most likely to emerge. Before proceeding further, we propose to supply a very brief epitome of his discourse.

The preacher, firstly, informs his audience that the subject of his address is fixed for him by the Roman Catholic bishop to whom he pays obedience (pp. 5, 6). He states, without claiming to prove it, the view of the Pontiff's spiritual office and position, taken by members of the Church of Rome in the present day (p. 9). He describes the obligations of his co-religionists to the Pope arising from a sense of duty, and from a sense of gratitude (p. 15). Then follow a few sentences on the excellence of the character displayed by Pius the Ninth, and the severity of his trials (p. 16). A second part of the Sermon is devoted to an account of the present crisis in Italy. It commences with a brief and brilliant sketch of the conversion of the barbarians in

<sup>1</sup> Eccl. Pol. vii. 15, § 5. Hooker's spelling of the cities is 'Mentz, Colen, and Trevers.'

the earlier Middle Age (p. 17), of the rise and decay of episcopal temporalities; and then proceeds to point out that a large portion of the Pope's subjects now side with his enemies. A statement of their case, as they might be imagined to put it forth, is then given (p. 19), and a rejoinder follows (p. 20). Illustrations in favour of the preacher's views are sought from the history of the Israelites (p. 23). The stiff-necked character of the Roman people is next adduced; their contests with their sovereigns; the seventy years' secession to Avignon. S. Bernard is cited as a witness to the grievous faults of this nation 700 years ago (p. 24). The analogy of Israelitish history is again insisted on and continued (p. 28).

The preacher proceeds to argue for the happiness of small states, instancing Belgium, Holland, Switzerland. But the real question for the Roman people is (he maintains) *one of spiritual life or death* (p. 29); an assertion, however, which is followed by certain admissions to which we must subsequently call attention (p. 31). Then ensues a passage, powerful, eloquent, unexceptionable in itself, respecting the malice and injuries of Satan (p. 33). The duty of prayer is then urged; and the special object of prayer as regards the Pope is stated to be this: 'that the territory still his should not be violently taken from him' (p. 36).

The two following pages describe, with much beauty, the spirit and temper in which all prayer should be offered (p. 38). The probability of the Pope retaining Rome is considered, and regarded as the more probable side of the alternative (p. 41). But the other side is also considered, calmly and without despondency (p. 43). A comparison between the Roman Catholics in Italy and in England is then made; and some eminently beautiful sentences lead to the conclusion that God will give the suppliants what they ask, or will give them something better.

We are deeply conscious that to comment upon such a subject, and especially when treated by such a person, is a serious and even a solemn task. Moreover, at the very outset, voices of this kind hover round us: 'You are Anglican, Protestant, insular, 'narrow-minded, incapable of understanding the depth and difficulty of the problems at issue.' We understand such language to mean that we ought simply to accept in this matter, without question, the teaching of Archbishop Manning, Dr. Newman, the late Dr. Faber, the Dublin reviewers, and Sir John Simeon.

Now, we cannot thus consent to abnegate what we believe to be our rights. Even supposing that the above-named Roman Catholic authors were all agreed (which is very far from being the case), we should still claim the right of trying to weigh the



evidence before us. Yet thus much we willingly concede, that it is best, under the circumstances, to appeal as little as possible to Anglican witnesses. We shall summon into court almost exclusively French, German, and Italian writers; and, speaking roughly, they may be classed as follows:—

*Firstly*, we shall constantly appeal for facts to the *Annuaire des deux Mondes*. Having studied this repertory of information since its earliest issue, and having used opportunities of testing its value, we aver that, though often mistaken in its prophecies, it is extraordinarily accurate and trustworthy as regards facts. With it we shall conjoin two works easily accessible to the English reader—Dr. Döllinger's 'Die Kirche und die Kirchen,' and Farini's 'Lo Stato Romano.' The English translations of these two books will be employed.<sup>1</sup> In the latter case, it is *mainly* on the documents therein cited that we shall rely; because, though many may differ from Farini's comments, no one has ever questioned the genuineness of these documents.

*Secondly*, we shall make use of papers contributed by various writers to the *Revue des deux Mondes*. Besides quoting volume and page, as will be done in the case of citations from the *Annuaire*, we shall have here, in each instance, the name of the writer.

*Thirdly*, we shall give extracts from, or accounts of, certain Italian publications named at the head of this article, written by Azeglio, Perfetti, Filalete (supposed to be Passaglia), and Bartolommeo.

If any fact is mis-stated by us, we shall be glad to correct the error in a future number of this Review. Our chief task will be that of laying before our readers statements drawn from the above-named sources, and of comparing them with the positions taken up in Dr. Newman's able discourse. And here, *in ipso limine*, we wish to proclaim our recognition of the comparatively temperate tone of his Sermon; which, indeed, by the side of some publications of his English co-religionists, is moderation itself. Nevertheless, it seems to us calculated to leave on the mind an impression far different from that produced by the writings to which we have just referred.

There are in this discourse particular passages to which we must call attention as we proceed. But there are two or three general principles underlying the drift of Dr. Newman's argu-

<sup>1</sup> Döllinger. 1 vol. (London: Hurst and Blackett.) 1862. Translated by W. B. MacCabe. Of the account of the Roman States here given the *Dublin Review* complained; comparing the author, by way of blame, to Lingard; and calling him a Dryasdust, who simply stuck to facts! Well might a weekly publication term this language 'sublime and unconscious irony!'

Farini.—Translated by Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. 4 vols. (Murray. 1851.) Vol. IV. translated by a Lady, under the superintendence of Mr. Gladstone.

ment, which ought to be noticed before we touch upon details. For these principles will be found, directly or indirectly, to colour our author's treatment of the entire question. We refer especially to (I.) Dr. Newman's language about the Reformation and the Reformers; (II.) his tone respecting the decay of certain institutions; (III.) the manner in which he seems to ignore the real difficulties attendant upon the clerical administration of those functions of government which are ordinarily entrusted to laymen; (IV.) his appeal to the excellence of the ruler's character.

I. The view of the Reformation supported by Dr. Newman will be fitly introduced by the following passages from the works of two great Roman Catholic theologians of Germany. The first relates to the grounds and causes of the Reformation; the second, to the motives by which Luther and Calvin were actuated.

'We must admit that the anxiety of the German nation to see the *intolerable abuses and scandals* in the Church removed *was fully justified*; and that it sprang from the better qualities of our people, and from their moral indignation at the desecration and corruption of holy things, which were degraded to selfish and hypocritical purposes. We do not refuse to admit that the great separation, and the storms and sufferings connected with it, were an awful judgment upon Catholic Christendom, which clergy and laity had but too well deserved—a judgment which has had an improving and salutary effect. The great intellectual conflict has purified the European atmosphere, has impelled the human mind on to new courses, and has promoted a rich scientific and literary life. . . . We have also to acknowledge that in the Church the *rust of abuses, and of a mechanical superstition, is always forming afresh*; that the servants of the Church sometimes, through insolence and incapacity, and the people through ignorance, brutify the spiritual in religion, and so degrade, and deform, and misemploy it to their own injury. The right reforming spirit must therefore never depart from the Church, but, on the contrary, must periodically break out with renovating strength, and penetrate the conscience and the will of the clergy.'<sup>1</sup>

'An obstacle, which makes the Lutheran view more pardonable, since it shows that it *sprung out of a true Christian zeal*. . . . The Reformers, in the excess of a pious zeal, rejected all exertion on the part of man. . . . It would be in the highest degree unjust if we did not show that, according to the Lutheran system, the renovation of sinful man, the moral change—in a word, *sanctification*—must attach to the confiding reception of the declaration of the forgiveness of sin. . . . Who knows not the brilliant description of faith in his [Luther's] preface to St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans? . . . Here the Reformers were evidently misled by the most vague, most confused, yet *withal honourable feelings*. . . . At all events, it is *highly honourable to his [Calvin's] perspicacity, as well as to his Christian spirit*, that he saw, or at least felt, that by means of mere learned investigation, the believer could obtain no satisfactory result.'<sup>2</sup>

With these passages may be conjoined the expression of the

<sup>1</sup> Döllinger, *The Church and the Churches*, pp. 17, 18.

<sup>2</sup> Möhler, *Symbolism* (Eng. Tr.) vol. i. pp. 130—133, 159, 185, 208; and vol. ii. p. 208.

views of another Roman Catholic, the late King of Bavaria, as reported by Dr. Döllinger:—

‘As a sincere Christian, the King was convinced of the permanent future of Christianity, and therefore he could not think that the great division and warfare of the Christian confessions could hopelessly remain for all time, that noble intellects would always be uselessly employed in hurting one another. He thought that separation had, by God’s permission, had its time, and must serve to higher purposes. This time, if it had not elapsed, was near its end, and he therefore believed that, in spite of all polemical bitterness, in spite of all intermingling of impure self-seeking, in spite of the political interests which were always making use of the division for their own objects, a day of reunion would come for Christian nations, the promise of one fold and one Shepherd would be fully accomplished. . . . He saw that the future junction could not be expected in the form of a simple, unaided, mechanical reunion of the divided confessions. It was also clear to him that there could be no thought of a mere absorption of one Church by the other. He thought that a certain process of purification must be gone through on both sides, and it must be recognised that each of the two bodies, though in an unequal degree, had to receive good from the other, each had to purify itself from faults and one-sidedness by the help of the other, to fill up gaps in its religious and ecclesiastical life, to heal wounds; and neither could be expected to give up an actual good which it had proved in life and history. Under these conditions, sooner or later in the heart of Europe, in Germany, the process of reconciliation and union would go on.’<sup>1</sup>

Of such sentiments as these we have found but very little trace in Dr. Newman’s publications, since he joined the Church of Rome. We do not know that he has ever, with Möhler, given the continental Reformers any credit for good intentions; or, with Döllinger, admitted that the desire for Reformation sprang ‘from the better qualities of the German people.’ We speak under correction; but, to all appearance, that great movement is, in Dr. Newman’s judgment, simply evil. In the sermon before us it is ‘the Protestant revolt’ (p. 17); ‘Protestantism, that bitter, energetic enemy of the Holy See’ (p. 42). And again (p. 44), ‘the violence of the Reformation . . . it has bred infidels to its confusion.’

It would carry us too far from our present subject to comment properly on these last words; to consider what amount of unbelief has arisen from the licence of Protestantism, and how much from the repression exercised by Rome. We should have to ask whether the infidels, only too sadly numerous and energetic, bred in those countries which accepted the Reformation, had proved worse than Diderot, than Voltaire, than Ernest Renan; all of whom were born and brought up in Roman Catholic France. And, as regards the success of that system of stern and cruel repression exercised before the Reformation, we would fain com-

<sup>1</sup> *Guardian*, June 8, 1864.

mend to the thoughtful reader the following words of a living writer:—

‘There will be, I say, in spite of you, unbelief and immorality to the end of the world, and you must be prepared for immorality more odious, and unbelief more astute, more subtle, more bitter, and more resentful, in proportion as it is obliged to dissemble. . . . The heresies of the East germinated in the West of Europe and in Catholic lecture-rooms with a mysterious vigour, upon which history throws no light. . . . The acutest intellects became sceptics and misbelievers, and the head of the Holy Roman Empire, the Cæsar Frederick the Second, to say nothing of our miserable King John, had the reputation of meditating a profession of Mahometanism. It is said that, in the community at large, men had a vague suspicion and mistrust of each other’s belief in Revelation. A secret society was discovered in the Universities of Lombardy, Tuscany, and France, organized for the propagation of infidel opinions; it was bound together by oaths, and sent its missionaries among the people in the disguise of pedlars and vagrants.

‘The success of such efforts was attested in the south of France by the great extension of the Albigenses, and the prevalence of Manichæan doctrine. The University of Paris was obliged to limit the number of its Doctors in Theology to so few as eight, from misgivings about the orthodoxy of its divines generally. The narrative of Simon of Tournay, struck dead for crying out after a lecture, “Ah, good Jesus, I could disprove Thee, did I please, as easily as I have proved,” whatever be its authenticity, at least may be taken as a representation of the frightful peril to which Christianity was exposed. Amaury of Chartres was the author of a school of Pantheism, and has given his name to a sect; Abelard, Roscelin, Gilbert, and David de Dinant, Tanquelin and Eon, and others who might be named, show the extraordinary influence of anti-Catholic doctrines on high and low. Ten ecclesiastics and several of the populace of Paris were condemned for maintaining that our Lord’s reign was past, that the Holy Ghost was to be incarnate, or for parallel heresies.’

So spoke Dr. Newman, as a Roman Catholic, only a few years since.<sup>1</sup> Surely, then, we may assert that Protestantism is not the only school of thought that has bred infidels. We have no wish to shut our eyes to facts: of course we know where Chubb and Toland, where Hume and Strauss were nurtured. But we also know, and have looked somewhat closely into, the sad biography of Giacomo Leopardi, and most certainly that greatest literary genius of modern Italy was not made an infidel by Protestantism. An inhabitant of the Roman States, a subject of the Pope, he had all those advantages—*we* should say, all those terrible temptations—which such a mind was sure to meet with in the Rome of the nineteenth century.

And now, earnestly desiring not to be hopelessly one-sided, we quit this portion of our subject with words which sound to us both wise and temperate. ‘The Reformation,’ says an English Bishop, ‘was not the work of a year, or of a generation. *Its*

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on University Subjects, pp. 298—304. London: Longman & Co. 1859.

'foundation was laid both in the good and in the evil qualities of our nature. Love of truth, reverence for sacred things, a sense of personal responsibility, a desire for the possession of full spiritual privileges, co-operated with the pride of human reason, the natural impatience of restraint, and the envy and hatred inspired among the nobles by a rich and powerful hierarchy, to make the world weary of the papal domination, and desirous of reform in things spiritual and ecclesiastical.'

II. We turn to the consideration of our author's sentiments respecting decaying institutions. It will be necessary, in the first place, to state our own.

We confess, then, to belong to that school of historic students who believe that, as a *general* rule, nothing is crushed from without until it is ripe to perish from within. Such ripeness for ruin and overthrow may arise from one of two causes; or, as is perhaps more common, from a combination of both. The first cause is, that an institution which was admirably adapted for a certain state of manners and society has done its work; and 'that which decayeth and waxeth old is nigh to vanishing away.' Its good elements are less needed than heretofore; its less benignant features have become more prominent. Look at feudalism. Writers of a temper not likely to be unduly favourable to that régime, such as Froude, and a far greater historian, Sismondi, have dilated with force and eloquence on the beneficial effects wrought by the feudal system in the Middle Ages; on its many noble characteristics; the love, and reverence, and reciprocity of sentiment between high and lowly which it called forth. Shall we therefore regret that, at length, it came to an end? A poet answers, Yes:—

'Tis sad to watch Time's desolating hand  
Doom noblest things to premature decay:  
The feudal court, the patriarchal sway  
Of kings.'

Granted: if the decay were really premature; if the feudal court came near to the fulfilment of its ideal; if kings still cherished the truly patriarchal spirit. But how seldom is this the case! How much nearer the real state of things are the well-known words of the Laureate:—

'The old order changeth, yielding place to new,  
And God fulfils Himself in many ways,  
Lest one good custom should corrupt the world.'

Much more when the good custom includes some deeply dangerous elements. 'I would not have spared the blood of my body or the guilt of my soul to serve the house of Glenallan,' is a speech

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Harold Browne, Bishop of Ely. Preface to his work on the Thirty-nine Articles.

that embodies, we believe, the true spirit of feudalism in its more unlovely aspects.

Now, with all respect, we wish to assert that the discourse before us exhibits to our mind only a partial and faltering recognition of these important truths. Thus, for example, from the way in which the loss of temporal power by the prince-bishops is spoken of by Dr. Newman (pp. 17, 18), the impression left on the mind of a hearer would probably be, that this change arose from a simple act of wrong-doing on the part of the world towards the Church. We venture to see in it a natural result of social progress on the one hand, and forfeiture often incurred by the fault of the holders on the other.

Firstly, a natural result of social progress. More complex forms of society generally tend towards division of labour. The increased education of the laity rendered it less necessary to apply to the clergy for a due execution of the offices of secular government. Although men of versatile genius have unquestionably fulfilled with signal success the combined offices of priests and statesmen: yet too often has one class of duties been merged in the other. Few think of a Cardinal Richelieu, or a Cardinal Mazarin, as princes of the Church; they are regarded simply in the light of prime ministers, who were practically laymen. Even of a later and far milder specimen of the class, Cardinal Fleury, Lacretelle has said, '*l'homme de cour paroissoit plus en lui que le prêtre; . . . sur tout autre point que celui de la cupidité, il avoit la morale des courtisans.*'<sup>1</sup> This is a danger which S. Bernard, in the twelfth century; the historian Fleury, in the eighteenth; and the spiritually-minded Antonio Rosmini, in our day, have all dwelt upon. S. Bernard was indeed far from desiring the overthrow of the temporal power of the Popes, and was strongly moved against the Romans of his day, by reason of their conduct towards the reigning Pontiff, his friend Eugenius. But he more than hints at the presence of worldliness and avarice in Rome. 'Who will vouchsafe to me,' he writes to Eugenius, 'before I die, to beho'd the Church of God as she was in the days of old: when Apostles let down their nets for a draught, not a draught of silver or gold, but a draught of souls? How do I long that thou shouldst inherit the voice of him, whose seat thou hast obtained. *Thy money, said he, perish with thee.* O voice of thunder! O voice of grandeur and of excellence! May all who hate Sion be confounded and turned backward at its dread sound. This does thy mother earnestly expect, and indeed demand of thee; for this do the sons of thy mother, the little

<sup>1</sup> Tome ii. lib. vii. cit. ap. Sismondi, *Hist. des Français*, tome xxviii. p. 154. It is fair to add that Sismondi's own remarks tend to show the existence of some very Christian elements in the character of Cardinal Fleury.



'ones with the elders, yearn and sigh; that every plant, which 'the heavenly Father hath not planted, may be rooted up by 'thy hands.'<sup>1</sup> We may also here cite a passage from a discourse by Fleury. It is perhaps somewhat over-strained; nevertheless, it is desirable that this side of the case should be fairly contemplated:—

'Since the bishops have found themselves to be lords, and associated in the government of States, they have thought that they possessed as bishops what in fact only belonged to them as lords, and have insisted on their right to judge sovereigns, not only in the confessional, but also in councils; and the sovereigns (ill-informed touching their own rights, as for instance, Charles the Bald and Louis d'Outre Mer) did not contest that authority. The ceremony of consecration, introduced about the middle of the eighth century, answered well as a cloak for this claim, as it appeared that the bishops, in placing the crown on the new kings, gave them the kingdom on God's behalf. . . . The Popes, rightly believing themselves to possess equal, or even greater, authority than the bishops, very soon began to undertake the regulating of differences between sovereigns, not in the way of mediation and intercession only, but in an authoritative manner, which was, in fact, disposing of crowns. . . . Behold to what a pitch the inconveniences of the alliance between the episcopal dignity and temporal lordships were carried. In those less enlightened times, it was believed that to be bishop and lord was better than to be simply bishop; but it was not taken into consideration that the lord injures the bishop, as we unhappily see even at this present time [about A.D. 1700] in Germany and Poland. Under these circumstances, truly Hesiod's wise maxim is good, that half is better than the whole. But why refer to Hesiod? We have the teaching of Jesus Christ Himself, who said that virtue when alone is better than virtue accompanied by riches. In that confusion of the two powers, even the seculars, on their side, arrogated to themselves that which did not belong to them. Often the lords would put priests into churches on their lands, without any participation of the bishop. Kings claimed to dispose of bishoprics, although freedom of election was ordered by the Councils. The learned Florus (deacon in the church at Lyons) remarks, and very rightly, that under the Roman Empire, neither the emperors nor the magistrates usually interfered in the election of bishops, or in the ordination of priests, because then the bishops had no temporal power, as indeed they never have had in the Greek Empire. But, in the kingdoms formed out of the ruins of the Western Empire, the bishops were so powerful that the sovereigns' interests demanded that those dignities should be conferred on persons not suspected by them: for this cause the consent of the prince was necessary even in the most canonical elections. What I have said of the bishops must be taken as equally applicable to abbots', &c.

Or consider again the following comments upon the conduct of certain mediæval statesmen-bishops, engaged in the contest with the German Emperors:—

'Thus it happened at the German Court; and a great misfortune it was that its courtiers were bishops. These struggled amongst themselves

<sup>1</sup> *Epistola cexxxxix* § 6.

<sup>2</sup> *Troisième Discours sur l'Histoire ecclésiastique*. Not having this work of Fleury's at hand, we translate from the Italian version of the passage as given by Filalete.

to seize the helm of state, and Henry grew up wild with vices; and, what was worse, those ambitious prelates left in his childish heart evil recollections, which were the cause of his being at a later period so irreverent to the priesthood. Henry was a bad prince, but those bishops were worse, who by their domestic scandals had made him bad.

‘Hanno, Archbishop of Cologne, instigated Sigefried of Magonza, and Adalbert of Brema, and the three raised complaints against Agnes’s government; and, in order to give them some show of justice, they spread rumours against the fair fame of that excellent princess. . . . These were pure calumnies; and if afterwards his opposition to the Antipope won for Hanno the title of Saint, assuredly that slander of the virtuous Empress was a great disgrace to him.’

This passage is not cited, as some readers might imagine, from the pages of Sir James Stephen (although that brilliant essayist may be said to have anticipated it); but it is simply translated from a volume of the distinguished Benedictine monk of Monte Cassino, Luigi Tosti.<sup>1</sup> The question may be brought nearer our own time, by the citation of some remarks made by an English Roman Catholic, the biographer of Möhler, Mr. James Burton Robertson.

And here, once for all, we must apologize for making this paper so much like a mere string of extracts. It would be no doubt far more artistic, more agreeable to the writer, and far more pleasant to the reader, if in every case these passages were to be reproduced in a fresh shape, and woven into one continuous argument. But we fear lest in that case we might be suspected of unconsciously warping the sense of the writers whom we quote. It may be added, that in some instances (the Italian pamphlet by Massimo d’Azeglio is eminently here in point), the tone and temper of the writers is hardly less important than the substance of their allegations. We must, therefore, beg for patience on the part of our readers, and can only trust that, if they will but persevere to the end of this paper, they will find themselves in possession of a more solid and trustworthy mass of facts than would have been gained, if we had adhered to the more usual form of proceeding. The following is the language of Mr. Robertson. He is speaking of the period between the Reformation and the great French Revolution of 1789:—

‘The number of ecclesiastical principalities of Germany, though on the whole conducive to the temporal welfare of the people, were, in a spiritual point of view, attended with great disadvantages. The prelates, too exclusively engaged with cares of state, often entirely abandoned to their coadjutors the spiritual administration of their dioceses; and there were instances in the last century, where the character of the bishop seemed entirely merged in that of the prince.<sup>2</sup> . . . The members of the German

<sup>1</sup> *La Contessa Matilde e i Romani Pontifici*. Firenze: Barbèra, 1859. (Pp. 85, 6.)

<sup>2</sup> ‘An anecdote illustrative of the observation in the text is related of one of the Electors of Mayence in the last century. Passing in his carriage one day

Chapter, thus exclusively composed, were too often listless and given up to ease, indifferent to literature, little concerned about the great objects and interests of the Church, and evincing activity only in the obscure intrigues that preceded and accompanied the election of a bishop.

The fact alleged in this last passage seems to us to be all but totally ignored by Dr. Newman in the sermon under review. Any one gathering his ideas of the matter solely from his sermon, might suppose that the faults which led to the suppression of the prince-bishoprics had been wholly and entirely on one side; that their overthrow was simply a wicked and unprovoked act of spoliation. We submit that nothing can be more one-sided and incorrect than such a view.

III. But we pass onward to the third feature, namely, the manner in which Dr. Newman seems to ignore the real difficulties attendant upon the clerical administration of those functions of government which in our times are ordinarily entrusted to laymen.

We have made reference to cases, such as those of Mazarin, or the Archbishop of Mayence, in which the statesman, so to speak, devoured the ecclesiastic. Let us now turn to those in which the ecclesiastic is true to the spirit of his own profession.

There are three great circles of thought, those of ethics, theology, and jurisprudence, which frequently indeed coincide, but which all have special spheres and provinces of their own. The connexion between the two first-named is of the closest; for revealed religion includes a republication of the moral law; and he who offends against a pure code of ethics is at the same time guilty of a sin in the judgment of divines. But the sphere of jurisprudence diverges more widely. The sin of thought, so solemnly condemned in that great repertory of Christian morals, the Sermon on the Mount, lies entirely out of the reach of earthly law; the drunkard who keeps within his home, the man who is guilty of the basest ingratitude to his friend, are justly condemned, both by the moralist and the theologian; but they do not come within the reach of the civil magistrate.

Now the habits of mind cultivated by the divine and by the legist are, in many respects, essentially distinct. Each phase of thought has its own peculiar virtues; each has its own special dangers and temptation. A similar remark would hold good as

---

through the streets of his capital, he saw a man taken suddenly very ill. He stopped his carriage, and bade his footman fetch a clergyman from a neighbouring church; and seemed totally to forget that he himself was invested with powers to render the poor man spiritual aid.

‘Yet there were other ecclesiastical potentates (and among these the Prince-Bishops of Würzburg), who to the last remained true to the spirit of their sacred profession, and spent their ample revenues in promoting the interests of religion, and the moral and temporal well-being of their subjects.—Note by Mr. Robertson.

regards the functions of the ecclesiastic and the statesman, as distinguished from the judge. Consequently, any system which demands from its rulers the combination of gifts required for these several offices must *ipso facto* be adding very considerably to the difficulties attendant upon all government.

Dr. Newman speaks of the defunct prince-bishoprics and of the Papal rule in almost the same manner, as if they were completely similar. Such an incorrectness may be excusable in a sermon, because its brevity necessitates general statements: but a very considerable incorrectness it is, as has before been pointed out in the pages of this Review.<sup>1</sup> The Pope's temporal government is both better and worse than was that of the prince-bishops: better, in one remarkable feature; in other respects far worse. Its point of superiority lies in the free, noble, and varied manner in which the Sovereign Pontiffs have constantly thrown open the cardinalate. The chapters surrounding the prince-bishops of Germany had become solely and exclusively a body of nobly-born canons: and when once any society has resolved to keep out all admixture of fresh blood, its existence is doomed, and its overthrow is simply a question of time. The popes, without any unwise lapse into the opposite extreme, have again and again elevated the son of the peasant to a seat by the side of the son of an emperor; thus endeavouring, as Mr. Robertson well remarks,<sup>2</sup> to blend moderation and dignity with an ever fresh stream of energy, talent, and popular sympathy.

But in most other respects the Papal government has been far inferior to that of *good* prince-bishops in Germany, such as those of Würzburg. These last fell—the few good ones, partly because they were felt to be an anachronism, partly through the error of which we have just spoken:—the bad ones by the additional weight of their own excessive pomp and neglect of duty. But from one great source of mischief they had been comparatively, if not entirely, free. Although the head of each small state was an ecclesiastic, yet the civil officers employed under him were, as a general rule, laymen. In the Papal states, the rule is precisely the reverse; and this circumstance, respecting which Dr. Newman preserves entire silence, has produced evils of extraordinary magnitude.

A lay judge, trained in legal habits of mind, desires above all things that a prisoner should be *legally* convicted before he is punished. To tell him that a man is *morally* guilty is of no avail. He remits such cases to the moralist to deal with, and demands solid proof, on external testimony, of the man's crime: testimony, moreover, for the most part sifted by the skill of an

<sup>1</sup> *Christian Remembrancer* for April, 1862 (vol. xliii. pp. 285, 286.)

<sup>2</sup> *Memoir of Möhler*, p. xi.

opposing advocate. Now the ecclesiastic, speaking generally (we admit, of course, extraordinary exceptions), is unaccustomed to this judicial temper. Take for example the following case, which we give in the words of Mr. Gladstone :—

‘Under Leo XII. Cardinal Rivarola went as Legate *à latere* into Romagna. On the 31st of August, 1825, he pronounced sentence on five hundred and eight persons. Seven of these were to suffer death; forty-nine were to undergo hard labour for terms varying between ten years and life; fifty-two were to be imprisoned for similar terms. *These sentences were pronounced privately, at the simple will of the Cardinal,* upon mere presumptions that the parties belonged to the liberal sects; and, what is to the ear of an Englishman the most astounding fact of all, after a process simply analogous to that of a grand jury (I compare the process, not the persons), and *without any opportunity given to the accused for defence.*’<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Lyons, whose despatches are admitted to have been eminently fair, remarks of the Court of Rome, ‘that it shows ‘an extraordinary disregard to laws and forms in its dealings ‘with its subjects; and seems almost always to assume an ‘arbitrary power to act in each matter according to the circumstances of the moment.’ Döllinger, who cites these words, mentions a case of a governor declaring that, *for want of proof*, the accused could not be convicted, but still he should be punished with imprisonment! There are those who seem to imply that such things are *not* grievances, or are not felt as such. We shall believe them, when they have proved that the human mind is differently constituted in the Roman states from the way in which it is constituted in other parts of Europe.

We might give other instances of this injudicial temper. But we pass onward to a cognate defect of the Papal government, which seems to be almost imbedded in the system.

If any one were to refer to a modern work of Roman casuistry (say, for example, the two able volumes on ‘*Théologie Morale*,’ by the Archbishop of Rheims, Monsignor Gousset<sup>2</sup>) he would find an extremely large list of callings which are considered in the present age to afford grounds of exemption from observation of the days of fast and abstinence. Numbers of Frenchmen among those thus exempted would probably seek formal permission from the proper ecclesiastical authorities; but whether they did or did not take this step would be regarded in France, as in Belgium, Austria, and other countries of the Roman obedience, as simply a matter between themselves and their consciences, with which the temporal government could have no possible concern.

Now let us look at the Roman states in the year of grace

<sup>1</sup> Letter II. to the Earl of Aberdeen. London: Murray. 1851. Fifth Edition. Balbo (*Storia d'Italia*); Cantù (*Cento Anni*); Döllinger (*Church and Churches*), as well as Farini, *all* give the same account; but there seems to be a slight confusion in some of them as regards dates.

<sup>2</sup> Paris: Lecoffre, 1850.

1856. In that year the Inquisitor Aivaldi published an edict which called for the denunciation of every *ecclesiastical* and *religious* offence which might come to the knowledge of others. A maid-servant was bound to inform the Inquisition, if any person in the house where she lived had eaten meat on a Friday or Saturday evening. The maid-servant who failed to do this became liable to excommunication and to punishment. Now will the English defenders of the Papal government condescend to notice facts of this sort, and honour us with a plain reply to the simple question, *Is such an edict, or is it not, a mark of good government?* The *Civiltà Cattolica*, the organ of the Jesuits in Rome, a paper specially patronized by the Pope, *has* given a reply. It declared, in its issue of December 20th, 1856, that 'Aivaldi had only done his duty.' This announcement is plain, frank, intelligible. We gather from it that, in the judgment of the chief organ of the Papal government, it is a simple act of duty to make a maid-servant a spy upon the acts of her master, and to threaten her with punishments, spiritual and temporal, if she does not reveal to constituted authorities the results of her *espionnage*. And as, of course, acts of duty on the part of governors ought to be accepted with thankfulness by all good persons among the governed, the knowledge that his servants stood to him in those relations ought, we suppose, to be a matter of sincere gratification to all dutiful subjects of the Sovereign Pontiff.

From German Roman Catholics, such as Dr. Döllinger, we also obtain a reply as clear and simple as that given in the *Civiltà*. But it does not accord with that of the *Civiltà*. From English Roman Catholic publications we can get no reply whatever.

Both Mr. Robertson and Dr. Döllinger select the Prince-bishop of Würzburg as the model of an ecclesiastical ruler. It is remarkable that this esteemed potentate conducted his government through lay administrators. Now in the Roman states the lotteries, theatres, houses of public amusement, and the *police*, are all under the care of priests. We deplore and execrate the heinous crime of the miscreant, whoever he was, who cut short the life of Rossi by a dagger. If any man could have re-organized the miserable confusion of the Papal states, Pellegrino Rossi was the man. But it is well known that he insisted on a very considerable modification, in this respect, of the mode of administering the states of the Church.

Cicero has few warmer admirers than Dr. Newman. That philosophic statesman warns us against all undue clemency, undue severity, and partiality in the infliction of punishments. 'Ita probanda est mansuetudo atque clementia, ut adhibeatur,



'reipublicæ causâ, severitas; sine quâ administrari civitas non potest. . . . Cavendum est etiam ne major pœna quàm culpa sit: et ne iisdem de causis alii plectantur, alii ne appellentur quidem.'<sup>1</sup> We much fear that Cicero *redivivus* would complain of the existence of *all* these errors in the Pontifical government of that city which he saved as Consul.

Not that we mean that any state completely succeeds in avoiding such faults. But in one country they may be rare, occasional, and more or less mitigated; in another common, frequent, and unmitigated. We regard it certainly as a sad blot on the history of British justice, that Dr. Newman should have been condemned to pay even a fine of 100*l.* as the result of the suit of Dr. Achilli against him; nor did we ever meet with any set of gentlemen who thought otherwise on this subject.<sup>2</sup> Yet even here there were surely some elements of mitigation. The conduct of the jury, of whom Sir Alexander Cockburn (now Chief Justice) declared 'that he never saw men so prejudiced;' the lamentable greediness for popular applause displayed by Lord Campbell: these features of the case can only be named in order to be condemned, and to be held up as a warning to posterity. But the remaining judges of the court took care to intimate their unanimous dissent from portions of the verdict; the fine was fixed at a sum which indicated, with unmistakeable clearness, what the authorities of the Queen's Bench thought of the amount of damage done to the character of the prosecutor: while the evidence, and the splendid speech of Sir A. Cockburn, left that prosecutor in such a plight that even Exeter Hall credulity broke down under the strain. Does any sane man doubt with whom the substantial victory lay? Wronged as he was, John Henry Newman had enjoyed and used his liberty of speech; and might, even in this moment of apparent defeat, feel that the Laureate's boast concerning England was no merely idle vaunt—

'It is the land that freemen till,  
That sober-suited freedom chose;  
A land where, girt with friends or foes,  
A man may speak the thing he will.'

<sup>1</sup> De Officiis, Lib. i. cap. 25.

<sup>2</sup> A brilliant novelist, a great admirer of Dr. Newman, has left on record his opinion. 'Do you see yonder that stout gentleman with snuff on his shirt? the eloquent Dr. McGuffog, of Edinburgh, talking to Dr. Ettore, who lately escaped from the Inquisition at Rome in the disguise of a washerwoman, after undergoing the question several times, the rack, and the thumbscrew. They say that he was to have been burned in the Grand Square the next morning; but between ourselves, my dear Colonel, I mistrust these stories of converts and martyrs.'—*The Newcomes*, chap. viii.

Thackeray was fond of thus suggesting names: Hector to bring up the thought of his rival—'raptaverat Hectora—corpus vendebat Achilles.' So Messrs. Winsor and Newton, who supply artists, appear in this same tale as Messrs. Soap and Isaac [Winsor Soap and Sir Isaac Newton].

But if this famous trial revealed anew the deep and hopelessly unjust prejudices of the average British jurymen; if it showed that there was one judge who, despite his previous protestations to the contrary, could descend even on the bench to the most miserable clap-trap; yet the waves of its influence broke into further circles than those of the seas which wash the shores of England. The further question inevitably arose: You, authorities of the city of Rome; you, who knew what this man was—what earthly consideration induced you to go on intrusting to his care the most responsible and delicate functions? This man, who in Germany would have been visited, says Döllinger, 'with an infamous punishment in a convict prison, was arraigned before the ecclesiastical courts in Rome, and was there treated with an indulgence such as it would have been impossible to meet with in any other country. It also appeared that, despite of the condemnation passed upon him by the Provincial of his Order, he had been taken as an associate and attendant in visitations, and that he was afterwards made a Professor in the College of Minerva at Rome, and then sent as a preacher to Capua.'<sup>1</sup>

It is sometimes asserted, it is more frequently implied, by Roman Catholic speakers and writers, that we 'English Protestants,' as they delight to call us *en masse*, are so prejudiced as to be unable to be fair even when we desire it. We are quite unable, on our part, to perceive that members of the Reformed communions enjoy a monopoly of prejudice. But as regards ourselves, we can only declare our earnest desire to be fair; and leave it to impartial judges, if such can anywhere be found, to decide upon the success or the failure of our endeavours. We have already made some admissions respecting the Achilli case, and we desire to make a few more before proceeding any further.

Let it, then, be fully and frankly admitted that scandals do occur in *all* religious communities; and that such communities are justified in adopting every fair and reasonable method of hiding them, provided that this can be effected without great injury on others. If a very sacred illustration may be adduced without irreverence, we may just allude to the conduct of S. Joseph; who not only (as Archbishop Trench has well remarked) was anxious to pardon one who must have *seemed* to be guilty of a grievous wrong towards him, but also intended to have kept the supposed sin from public knowledge.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Church and the Churches. (Eng. Tr.) p. 399. 'It was in the *Dublin Review* of June, 1850—a [Roman] Catholic periodical, published under the patronage of Cardinal Wiseman—that these facts were first brought to light.'—Note by Dr. Döllinger, *ubi supra*.

<sup>2</sup> S. Matthew i. 19.

Let it be further admitted—it is at the least the belief of the present writer—that such scandals as that of Achilli are not common in Rome. Bishop Burnet in his day, Mr. Dicey in our day—both extremely anti-Roman writers—have remarked on the great outward decorum of Rome; and for our part we are far from thinking that it has been an outward decorum only. On the contrary we believe, and it is one of the strong points on behalf of the temporal power, that Rome was up to the time of the French occupation a decidedly moral city. We do not, of course, intend to intimate that, in a population of 150,000 souls, there were no bad and immoral persons; but we do mean that, comparing it with other cities of the same size, with Florence or Milan, with Leeds or Edinburgh, we suppose it to have enjoyed a real and marked superiority.<sup>1</sup> That such superiority has been very seriously impaired by the presence of the French regiments since 1848 seems to admit of no reasonable doubt; though we have not sufficient evidence to judge of the proportions which the mischief has attained.

But the point on which we here desire to insist is this: that, if once a case of crime does come before tribunals, it is fatal to confidence, it is a real and deep grievance, if the public learn that a priest is treated in one way, a layman in another. Mr. John Stuart Mill, in his very powerful critique upon Michelet, observes that in the time of à Becket a priest had no chance of a fair trial before a lay tribunal: and it is on this ground that the resistance of that primate to the Constitutions of Clarendon may be justified. Very opposite to this state of things is the condition of Rome under the Sovereign Pontiffs. Towards the clergy there has *not* been exercised that wholesome severity which Cicero pronounced to be indispensable to good government. If a priest and a layman have been participators in the same crime, not only must they be tried by different courts of justice, but the priest is subjected to a milder form of punishment—*un grado*

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Dicey ('Rome in 1860') is against us here: but to us his chapter on the subject is not conclusive. The following remarks of this writer (cited, we admit, *ex parte*) deserve consideration. 'Rome is, externally, the most moral and decorous of European cities. . . . From various motives this feature is, I think, but seldom brought prominently forward in descriptions of the Papal city. Protestant and liberal writers slur over the facts, because, however erroneously, they are deemed inconsistent with the assumed iniquity of the Government and the corruptions of the Papacy. . . . All the amusements are regulated with the strictest regard to their morals. . . . In the print-shops one never sees a picture which even verges on impropriety. . . . Not only is vice kept out of sight. . . . but its private haunts and resorts are absolutely and literally suppressed. In fact, if priest-rule were deposed, and our own Sabbatarians and Total Abstinence men and Societies for the Suppression of Vice reigned in its stead, I doubt if Rome could be made more outwardly decorous than it is at present.' For the other side, see Mr. D.'s book (Macmillan, 1861.) The Positivist, M. Taine, employs ambiguous language: but on the whole seems to doubt the morality of Rome.

(says the text of the existing law)—*un grado di minorazione di pena*. Well might Massimo d'Azeglio assert, that 'an inverse proportion of punishment would be the more righteous.'

We may have occasion, before we conclude, to draw attention to the case of Canon Reali. We are indeed far from forgetting, or from wishing our readers to forget, that the statement of the case is in some measure an *ex parte* one. Yet when this very distinguished theologian declares that a particular person has been made a bishop to avoid a pecuniary scandal, how can we—with the Achilli case before us—declare such a statement to be *à priori* impossible or incredible? And then again, how does the following *literal* translation of an authoritative document tend to exalt our notions of the administration of justice in Rome?—

'It was in truth to be hoped that the Presbyter Eusebius Reali, of the congregation of Canons Regular of the Most Holy Saviour of the Lateran, after having publicly retracted his errors committed in times past, would perfectly keep the promise which he had made. But it is clearly evident from public acts that he has returned to his vomit (*ipsum ad vomitum rediisse*), and has entered upon a course of life, which is not only unfitting a religious (*viro religioso*), but which gives cause of scandal and grievous offence to Christian people. Since, then, he is a disgrace and an injury to the congregation of which he is a member, and no hope of his amendment can be seen, our most holy Lord Pius, ninth of the name, has thought it good, albeit with unwilling mind, that the diseased sheep should be separated from his brethren. Consequently he intrusts it to the Father Abbot General of the aforesaid congregation, that he should proceed against him [Reali] to the length of expulsion, without going through the prescribed forms (*omissis præscriptis formis*), and declares him expelled, all obstacles notwithstanding (*expulsumque esse declarat. Contrariis quibuscunque non obstantibus*).

'Given at Rome, from the Secretariate of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, on this 13th day of July, 1861.

(Signed)

'N. CARDINAL PARACCIANI CLARELLI, *Prefect*.

'A. ARCHBISHOP OF PHILIPPI, *Secretary*.'

It may be said that this document makes against our allegation; for is it not a case of a *priest* being severely treated? We reply that the contrariety exists in appearance only, not in reality. We were speaking of priests charged with *moral* offences. Canon Reali declares that *his* offence has been the publication of a book against the temporal power of the Pope, and a warm sympathy with the cause of Italian unity. He asserts that he *never* made any retraction such as is named in the above document; that he took no more than the usual holiday; and he challenges the fullest inquiry. His great learning, his unblemished character, and his antecedents generally, plead loudly on behalf of a fair hearing. For the present, it is enough to ask whether in any other realm of Europe a man could be expelled from a post of

dignity by a document containing expressions of a grievously insulting character, and *omissis præscriptis formis*!

A great part of the remainder of this article must necessarily be occupied with the illustration of the point urged in this section; namely, the great difficulty attendant upon such a temporal government as that at present exercised in Rome. But let it for the moment be dismissed with the following words of Dr. Döllinger:—

‘It is further not to be denied that for a hundred years a tendency to secularization has passed through the whole of Europe. The union of spiritual dignities with temporal officialism has, henceforward, no sympathy to reckon on from the nations of Europe. Even the German spiritual principalities, in which, unlike the Papal States, the administration was chiefly in lay hands, have been destroyed, not merely by revolution, but by public opinion, which saw in them something foreign to the age, unnatural, a ruin of the past; and since 1814 not a single voice has been raised for their restoration. In our time, therefore, an union of temporal functions and action with the ecclesiastical is no longer an element of strength, but of weakness. Nothing gives rise to more bitter feelings than the application of secular governmental measures, or even of the power and chastisement of the police, to effect religious purposes; or the reverse, the application of religious means to political objects. . . . It is difficult to reject the opinion that lay hands are better suited to direct the action of state and police, with their manifold increasing material wants and cares; they are better suited than those of priests for a police and administrative omnipotence, a care for lotteries, theatres, gaming-houses, and houses of public entertainment, for managing passports and manufactories.’<sup>1</sup>

IV. We have now to consider what force of argument lies in Dr. Newman’s appeal to the unquestioned and unquestionable excellence of the reigning Pontiff’s private character.

A great majority of the most philosophic among the Fathers, of metaphysicians both Platonic and Aristotelian, perhaps of the Schoolmen, certainly of modern psychologists, maintain that the soul is a simple substance; and that though, for convenience sake, we speak of its various faculties, these are in reality only different ways and modes by which the soul can exert herself. Nevertheless, forasmuch as we do seem to see certain souls employing their energy in one direction rather than another; in the employment, for instance, of the cognitive rather than of the emotional faculties, or the reverse; we are accustomed, in common parlance, to speak of the gifts of head and heart as being distinct, and at times apparently opposed. The novelist who recently gave the world ‘A Strange Story,’ which portrayed a being possessed of one set of faculties only, was of course, most literally ‘romancing;’ but his wild conception was still perfectly intelligible.

There are positions which summon into activity one class of

<sup>1</sup> The Church and the Churches, pp. 460, 464.

the soul's faculties rather than another. The greatest woman whom the Church of Rome has ever canonized, S. Theresa of Spain, is reported to have said that a spiritual director ought to be both learned and devout; but that, if both gifts could not be found in one man, it were better to have the learning without the devotion, than the devotion without the learning. The late Dr. Faber, citing this statement in one of his works, declares, 'that of all this saint's wise words, and they are innumerable, 'she never uttered one that was more like herself than that.'

Now, *mutatis mutandis*, this sentiment, whether sound or not in itself, may surely be transferred with safety to the science of temporal government. A ruler should, if possible, be at once able and good. Sanctified intellect is a grand and ennobling spectacle, whensoever and wheresoever it is manifested; but seldom grander than when witnessed on the throne of a mighty people. Such a sight we recognize in our own Alfred: such a memory does France, nay Europe, honour in the sainted Louis IX., 'The noblest and holiest of monarchs,' says Dr. Arnold; 'Perhaps,' writes Hallam, 'the most eminent pattern of unswerving probity and Christian strictness of conscience, that ever held the 'sceptre in any country.' 'Where,'—asks Keble concerning the thirteenth century,

'Where shall the holy Cross find rest?  
On a crown'd monarch's mail'd breast:  
Like some bright angel o'er the darkling scene,  
Through court and camp he holds his heavenward course serene.'

A saint upon a throne, a Daniel or a Nehemiah in kings' courts, endowed with the gifts of mind which are needed for a sovereign or a statesman: what Christian but desires that such events were more frequent than they are or have been? But alas! just as the penetrative gaze of that famous *Española* was compelled to consider the possibility of learning and devotion being found apart; even so too must we, alike in social intercourse and in political life, too often expect to find severed asunder the qualities which we would gladly see united. 'Is it not a pity,' says a lively tale-writer, 'that people who are bright and clever should so often be exceedingly improper; and that those who are never improper should so often be dull and heavy?' Yes, it is a pity; in the sense that a distorted and disjointed state of things is altogether a pity. The world would be far other than it is, if all good persons were clever and attractive, all bad ones stupid and repulsive. It would be far other than it is, if the immoral, the irreligious, the unscrupulous never combined with their faults great intellectual gifts and some really high and noble qualities; if the philanthropic, the patriotic



and the devout were always as judicious in their choice of means, as they are zealous and single-hearted in their ends.

It may be said that this is an afflicting view of human nature. We think that it is so. But if it be a true view, if it be a part of our sad inheritance from the fall of our first parents, then it is simply idle to ignore it; foolish to attempt to think and speak, as if the case stood otherwise.

Look for a moment at the Emperor Julian. Who but must deplore, with awe and sorrow, his apostasy from the faith of Christ? And yet never did the 'great and grave' Prudentius better vindicate his claim to be the *Christian* poet of his era than when he showed that he had the eye to see, and the courage to proclaim, that this enemy of the Cross was of the bravest as a general, of the most justly famed as a legislator, in speech and act a well-wisher to his country, and, though faithless to his God yet not faithless to the lower interests of the Empire—

'Ductor fortissimus armis;  
Conditor et legum celeberrimus; ore manūque  
Consultor patriæ; . . .

Perfidus ille Deo, sed non et perfidus orbi.'<sup>1</sup>

Or think of such an one as Henry IV. of France, known in earlier life as Henry of Navarre. His private life is simply scandalous, and merits the severest reprobation. But it would be mere partizanship and contempt for the truth of history, were we to deny that, as a sovereign, he fairly earned that love which rendered him, for at least two succeeding centuries, a native idol. His gaiety of valour, his cheerfulness and endurance, his earnest (and, for his lifetime, successful) endeavours to blend in one the classes that had been at variance, his faithful toil, in company with his great minister Sully, at the entire machinery of government—these things cannot possibly be ignored by any fair and just narrator.<sup>2</sup>

Let us look at an instance on the other side. It would not be easy to name a premier of Great Britain more honourable, courteous, dignified, and unimpeachable in all the relations of private life, than was Spencer Perceval. Does it necessarily follow, that he was acting wisely and justly when he resolved to run the risk of rebellion in Ireland rather than concede the right of voting to Roman Catholics? Or must we not in part at least adopt the well-known words of Sidney Smith?—'You spend a 'great deal of ink about the character of the present prime minister. Grant you all that you write—I say, I fear he will

<sup>1</sup> Apotheosis 450. Cit. ap. Gibbon, chap. xxii. *sub fin.*

<sup>2</sup> The merits both of Julian and of Henri Quatre have received ample recognition from Prince Albert de Broglie.

'ruin Ireland, and pursue a line of policy destructive to the true interest of his country; and then you tell me, he is faithful to Mrs. Percival and kind to the Master Percevals! These are, undoubtedly, the first qualifications to be looked to in a time of the most serious public danger; but, somehow or another (if public and private virtues must always be incompatible), I should prefer that he owed for the veal of the preceding year, whipped his boys, and saved his country.'

We may seem to have made a long and needless digression in order to prove positions which none will question. Our apology must be, that these truisms appear to be, if not actually contradicted, at least all but totally ignored, in the remarkable discourse which we have undertaken to review.

Excepting in the way of occasional allusion, we do not intend to go further back than the year 1814. We select this date, at which the Popes were restored to their dominions by the Congress of Vienna; partly, because we naturally desire to limit the range of questions which might else require a volume; and partly, because it was at that epoch that the present form of Papal government was instituted.

Since that date there have been elected to the Pontifical throne: Leo XII. in 1823; Pius VIII. in 1829; Gregory XVI. in 1831; Pius IX. in 1846. Now against the private character of these Pontiffs we have not one word to urge; nor would we deny the fitness of each one of them for the office of a Christian bishop. But the peculiarity of their position required that they should be fitted for temporal rule likewise, and we ask, Of which one of them can it be truly affirmed that he displayed any great capacity for secular government?

Leo XII. was 'chosen partly on account of his opinions, and partly also because he was sickly, frail, and had the appearance of one likely to die very soon. He made Cardinal della Somaglia his minister—a man eighty years of age, and not of active habits. And so, at a most difficult and perilous period, when there was much required to be done, to be regulated, to be created, *the destiny of the country was placed in the hands of two grey-haired valetudinarians, weary of life and just dropping into the grave.*' So speaks Döllinger,<sup>1</sup> appealing to the evidence of the French Consul cited by Artaud,<sup>2</sup> and of Chateaubriand in his 'Memoires.'<sup>3</sup> The veto which France, Spain, and Austria each enjoy with reference to one particular candidate for this elective monarchy was on this occasion exercised by Austria against Cardinal Severoli. Lest, however, we should seem to be resting too exclusively on one single authority who, with all his genius,

<sup>1</sup> *Ubi supra*, p. 380.

<sup>2</sup> *Histoire de Leo XII.* tome i. p. 130.

<sup>3</sup> viii. 215, Ed. Berlin.

learning, and truthfulness, is still a German of the Germans, we will here summon into court an Italian witness, the historian Cesare Cantù. Let it be observed, that Cantù and Count Cesare Balbo are of all the distinguished living authors of Italy by several degrees the most pro-Papal:—

‘Leo XII. succeeded, 1823 . . . and gave to ecclesiastics the sole right of instituting and of judging even lay causes. . . . He re-established the Holy Office . . . replaced the Latin language in law courts and in the universities . . . entrusted the College of Rome to the Jesuits; and mixed “Commissions” of priests and officers terrified the Legations during the administration of Cardinal Rivarola, the Legate at Ravenna, who, on one single occasion, condemned 580 persons, then again suddenly pardoned and tried to reconcile *Sanfedisti* and *Carbonari* by marriages; and Heaven knows how those ended. But this did not stop assassinations for political motives (or which pretended to be such), which are the infamy of Romagna: and having at last had his own life attempted, he instituted a most severe “commission,” and redoubled his spies; at Ravenna seven persons were hung as political assassins. They may have been such, but they were universally pitied as political offenders. In short, when he offered free pardon to any one who would *spontaneously* come forward and “make divulgations,” thousands presented themselves. . . . Such were the governed and such their governors.’<sup>1</sup>

The elective form of monarchy has at all times presented some special difficulties. These difficulties are assuredly not lessened by that right of *veto* already mentioned, which each of the great Roman Catholic powers possess. It *has* happened, it may at any time happen, that a cardinal peculiarly fitted for the Papacy is sent as ambassador to Paris, Vienna, or Madrid. Now, courts being courts, a nuncio who is intelligent and bold is very likely indeed to give some cause of offence to the sovereign of the country. He will be *vetoed* by that court at the next vacancy for the Papacy. On the ground that he had recommended the reigning Pope to acknowledge the revolted republics of South America, and to send them bishops, Cardinal Giustiniani was by the court of Spain deprived of the prospect, by him most uncoveted, of the Papal chair.<sup>2</sup> We are, of course, deeply conscious that to speak thus is to regard the matter from its purely human side. But is it quite possible, even for the most sincere and devoted members of the Roman Church, entirely to ignore that side? If we may judge from their writings, this question must be answered in the negative.

Leo XII. put a stop to the practice of inoculation, or of vaccination, in his dominions. Our authorities differ as to which

<sup>1</sup> Storia di Cento Anni, vol. iii. p. 41. (Firenze: Le Monnier, 1851.)

<sup>2</sup> The account of this veto is one of the few curious and interesting facts to be gleaned from that miserable specimen of book-making, the late Cardinal Wiseman's personal ‘Recollections of the last Four Popes.’ As a source of history it is all but useless, and we observe with satisfaction that our Roman Catholic fellow Christians seem to eschew all reference to its pages.

of the two processes it was; but all agree in the main fact: namely, that this sovereign, who was animated with the purest intentions, put down the best remedy at that time known against small-pox. The immediate result was an increased number of deaths.

Della Genga (Leo XII.) died in 1829. He was succeeded by Cardinal Castiglione, who took the title of Pius VIII. Castiglione was a man of pure and exalted character; and if such be the *sole* and sufficient condition of fitness for the papal throne, he certainly possessed it. But, unfortunately, as had been the case with his predecessor, he was very aged and very sickly.<sup>1</sup> His first act was to place the direction of affairs in the hands of Cardinal Albini, who was with good reason reported to be the keenest opponent of all liberal ideas. Of his discretion in matters ecclesiastical a single sample must suffice. He announced his elevation in an encyclical condemning the liberty of the press, Bible societies, religious toleration, and civil marriage; and *this in a tone so violent that in France the Government did not dare to permit its publication.*<sup>2</sup> And yet, be it remembered, that Government was by many degrees the most favourable to the Church and the court of Rome that had existed in France for at least a century and a half; a Government zealous, even to the excess of imprudence, on behalf of many mediæval ideas of religious discipline. We leave it to our readers to imagine what must have been the *animus* of a document which seemed unduly violent in the eyes of the latest Bourbon sovereign of the direct line, the chivalrous and unfortunate Charles X.

Pius VIII. for the very brief space of his rule—not in all two years complete—directed his main political energy against secret societies. There are few Englishmen, whatever be their political creed, who will not agree with Dollinger, when he asserts that secret societies, however much to be deplored, are as necessary a consequence of the severe repression of opinion, as are inward maladies in the human body when external inflammation is violently driven backward from the skin. Given a thorough subjugation of the press, and a suspicious police lording it over a people dissatisfied with their condition, on the one side; a lively and intellectual population, capable of easily attaining in a genial climate the actual necessities of life, and peculiarly fond of social activity, on the other; and it needs no very sagacious prophet to discern the probable result, that these societies, *by their very nature, from their very secrecy*, should often mingle in one the worst and the best elements; and that the worst should frequently predominate

<sup>1</sup> Dollinger.

<sup>2</sup> *Nouvelle Biographie Générale* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1862), *Art. Pie VIII.* A publication of excellent authority on points of French history.

is only too credible. But the mode in which the Papal authorities met the evil is highly characteristic. Instead of allowing a little more liberty of thought and action, they promoted the establishment of *rival* associations, voluntary but non-legal. The best known was *supposed* to consist of none but genuine supporters of the Holy Faith (*la Santa Fede*). Hence the name of *Sanfedisti* given to its members; a name which must occasionally recur in this paper. This new society was chiefly composed of the lowest and poorest classes; but it soon got beyond the control of the Government, and in some districts acted as its master.

The defenders of the Roman court assert, and not without foundation, that it rarely inflicts the punishment of death. But then it must be added, by way of counterpoise, that its power of imprisonment is employed in the most arbitrary manner; that unhealthy gaols are filled with men who, in other countries, would be permitted to go on bail; and that much demoralization necessarily ensues. Cardinal Morichini, and Luigi Maraviglia, the Governor of Faenza, have made the strongest possible representations on this subject. The latter speaks of men remaining a whole year without a hearing, without a process; men, perhaps, free from even the suspicion of crime, but nevertheless imprisoned *merely from precaution*! We refer to this feature at this point of our discussion, because it was either towards the close of Leo XII.'s reign, or the commencement of that of Pius VIII. that this too celebrated mission of Cardinal Rivarola to the Romagna in consequence of some political assassinations resulted in an extraordinary amount of imprisonments.<sup>1</sup> This Cardinal convicted capitally, but without carrying out the sentence of death, 30 nobles, 156 who either occupied land or were shopkeepers, 74 *employés*, and 38 soldiers.

Pius VIII. died in 1830. He was succeeded by Mauro Capellari, a Carmelite monk, under the title of Gregory XVI.

Well does the writer of these lines recollect the day in the autumn of 1844, when, in the basilica of St. Peter's, he obtained an excellent view of the form and features of this venerable Pontiff, who had then reigned for a period of nearly fourteen years. We are all in some degree physiognomists, and the impression made upon the mind of this spectator was highly favourable. It seemed to him then, it seems to him in the vividness of a clear remembrance now, to be an eminently *good* countenance.

Nor was this impression a mistaken one. Gregory XVI. *was* an exceedingly good man; and moreover a man of letters, well

<sup>1</sup> *Vide supra*, note to extract from Mr. Gladstone's Letters. For Morichini and Maraviglia, see Dollinger, p. 397.

trained both in scholarship and theology. But we have observed that Dr. Newman *appears* to insinuate—we may possibly have misunderstood him—that the possession of such gifts as these can be satisfactorily alleged against those who accuse the chief of a state of faults of government. Now the case of Gregory XVI. forms a kind of crucial test of the value of such arguments. We shall here have recourse to the evidence of a new witness, M. Charles Gouraud. M. Gouraud, it is to be observed, is a defender of the temporal power of the Popes, and a decided admirer of Pius IX. In a paper which appeared in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, on the first of January, 1852, we are presented with the following sketch of the character and of the reign of Gregory XVI. :—

‘An austere priest and consummate theologian, Gregory brought with him to the Pontifical throne none of the virtues of a temporal prince. Specially anxious for the heavenly interests with which he was charged, he never turned his eyes downward, either on the wants of his country or the miseries of his time. His government displayed all the characteristics, all the harshness, and all the vices of despotism. He left the singular memory of a naturally humane and enlightened man, whose policy had never known either pity or enlightenment.

‘Gregory XVI. bequeathed to his successor frightful distress, disorder, and embarrassment ; all the resources of the country either forestalled or paralyzed ; agriculture destroyed ; a naturally fertile soil condemned to sterility, by the concentration of properties in the hands of a few large proprietors, or of the religious corporations, whose sole care was to receive their revenues without the smallest idea of increasing them ; not a single agricultural society ; no model farm for the improvement of cattle ; the inhabitants dependent on foreign production and enterprise for the most necessary articles of consumption ; trade impoverished, limited, and offering nothing, or nearly nothing, for exchange ; no great manufactures ; smuggling, organized on a gigantic scale, defrauding the excise of more than half its revenue ; not a railroad or a telegraph ; the roads uncared for ; carriage of goods difficult and costly in the extreme ; the taxes as numerous and as heavy as if the natural and artificial resources of the State had been admirably managed, and at the same time ill-arranged, crushing the landed property, and, in several provinces, as odious in their nature and mode of exaction as in their amount ; accounts in confusion, or rather, not in existence. French administration under Napoleon had, during its stay in the Roman states (as in other countries where it had transient rule), restored the finances. When Pius VII. re-entered Rome, he found the revenues of his states superior to their expenditure. This equilibrium was nearly preserved until the latter years of Leo XII.’s reign ; but, under Pius VIII., and lastly under the pontiff lately deceased [Gregory XVI.], not only had the public debt increased, and the expenses annually overpassed the receipts, but there was, in fact, no longer a vestige of finance administration at home. The Pontifical Government not only gave the public no account of the operations of its budget, but it had ended by not giving any account thereof to itself. The budgets encroached on one another ; no one knew either the expenditure of the past year, or the receipts of the current one. The Government of Gregory XVI. had, in the matter of finance, fallen below the level of the Ottoman Empire under his contemporary Sultan Mahmoud ; and all its financial learning consisted



in having a bag, into which, with one hand, it poured its revenue, whilst with the other it drew it out for its expenditure. The public debt had risen to 32,000,000 of crowns (more than 200,000,000 of francs) [8,000,000*l.* sterling]; the annual deficit amounted to about half a million (2,500,000 francs) [100,000*l.*]. The army, whose maintenance was very costly, inspired little confidence, and did but little service. The Roman troops were few in number, ill-disciplined, ill-paid, and not very trustworthy; the Swiss regiments excellent, but detested by the native troops and by the people. The same disorder existed in law and police. No codes; *inequality of Pontifical subjects in the eye of the law*; innumerable exemptions and privileges for the prelature and nobility; the administration of justice slow, doubtful, and expensive; for criminal cases, permanent military commissions. The police, which was never weary of persecuting liberals, was powerless to guarantee the public safety; not merely the country, but even the towns themselves, were infested with bandits. Add to all this, the wretched civil condition of the immense majority of the population; little or no education for the children; no career for the youths. The army—the habit of employing mercenaries had rendered that odious; diplomacy, politics, administration, magistracy—all these were reserved for ecclesiastics alone. Add further, the thousands of persons suspected and publicly marked out as such, to whom even the most subaltern municipal offices were closed. Add also, two thousand persons exiled, proscribed, and condemned for political offences!—*Revue des deux Mondes*, xiii. 1852, pp. 36—38.

We have italicized in the above certain statements respecting finance and justice. This is done by us in order that the reader may compare them with the truly astonishing assertion made by Dr. Newman, at page 28 of this discourse; an assertion to which we shall be compelled again and again to recur.

‘The Roman people, too, under the sway of the Popes, at least *have had a very easy time of it*; but alas! that people is not sensible of this, or does not allow itself to keep it in mind.’

But it was not mainly on this score that we placed before our readers the words of M. Gouraud. We wish that they should ask themselves that one simple question—Does or does not this description (which might be corroborated, if necessary, by abundance of fresh testimony) exhibit the possibility of an excellent bishop being a thoroughly bad sovereign? What is possible in one case is possible in others; and we shall feel ourselves obliged to repeat this query, when we arrive at a more advanced stage of our inquiry.

But although we have much more to urge with reference to the reign of Gregory XVI., we may fitly pause here for a moment, on the ground that enough has been adduced to exhibit some of the leading points of difference between our point of view and that occupied by Dr. Newman.

He sees no road to the union of Christendom, save in a submission such as he himself has made to the Papacy. We, too, yearn for unity, but it is a unity of such a character as that looked for by the late King of Bavaria. He writes as if all

rulers of states would do well to stand towards the Roman See in some such attitude as does Francis Joseph, Emperor of Austria, King of Bohemia and Hungary. We say, with a speaker in 'Measure for Measure,' 'Heaven grant us *its* peace, but *not* the King of Hungary's.' He seems to think that institutions, which have wrought a good work in the world, perish by external violence and by the wickedness of men, in the flower of their golden prime. We think that they perish because their work is done; that, though force from without may oppress, it is the corruption from within that overthrows; whence arise new orders of things in the all-wise and loving providence of God. He appears to write as if the goodness of a king renders his people inexcusable, if they murmur. We believe that a man may be most exemplary in his private life, and yet exercise a rule which proves on inquiry to be execrably bad.

It is our intention to notice some of the details of Dr. Newman's discourse, as well as those broader features on which we find ourselves at variance with him. On some points we shall do little more than supply large and copious extracts from French and from Italian sources of information, and content ourselves with suggesting what seems to follow as the natural conclusion.

But we think it right in this place to acknowledge also what appear to us the strongest points on the side of the Papal rule, whether adduced by Dr. Newman or not. And here, although for convenience sake we speak in the plural number, it must specially be understood that this Review cannot be committed to the result of impressions which must almost inevitably differ considerably in the case of individual contributors to its pages.

The supporters of the temporal sway start with the prestige that this rule has now, in some shape or other, practically endured for more than one thousand years; and that, though frequently interrupted, it has been restored again and again, not merely by foreign force, but in many cases—most notably so in 1814—with the good-will of the Romans themselves. 'That which endures has a place in the designs of God;' and few calm and thoughtful students of history will deny that the entire system, of which the Papal temporalities form no small portion, has been a most potent and in many respects a most beneficial agent, not only in the culture of things spiritual, but likewise in the formation of modern civilization. A fair survey of the effects of that influence is still perhaps a desideratum in our modern literature, and possibly must for a season still be lacking. For the dis-

---

1 De Broglie: *L'Eglise et l'Empire Romain*.

covery that Hume, Voltaire, Diderot, and Co. had been grievously unfair towards the mediæval Church has led to a reaction so violent, that many of our writers are being carried far beyond the generous but measured admissions of a Guizot, a Hallam, an Arnold, a Thierry, or a Palgrave. Strange to say, the most emphatic and unlimited praises of the religious system dominant in the Middle Ages are, at this moment, coming from the lips and pens of men of the Positivist school of thought, the admirers and disciples of M. Comte. We will cite one of its most recent utterances :—

‘For the first time in the history of the world, the moral law was separated from the civil law; the law of conscience and duty from the law or judicial ordinance and magisterial compulsion; the law persuading the will from the law compelling the action. The Church, wholly separate from and superior to the State, binding the feudal States of Europe into a vast Commonwealth, a spiritual democracy, where intellectual and moral force took precedency of birth, office, wealth, and regal power: such was the ideal partially realized between the tenth and thirteenth century. Partially realized, I say, for at no time was the separation between Church and State so perfect, as the theory of Catholicism indicated. Fully to have attained its high ends, the power of that Church should have been not less but greater. The Church in her best days was the safeguard of spiritual liberty against feudal oppression; but in its best days it was too weak for the task, and those days were far too short.’<sup>1</sup>

If anything could add to the singularity of this somewhat (as we think) over-strained eulogy, it would be the circumstance that the passage forms part of a lecture delivered in the capital of a Presbyterianized country. It is obvious, indeed, to remark that what was desirable in the thirteenth century, may be very undesirable in the nineteenth. But the number of occasions on which the Pope has been welcomed back to Rome, after an absence of very different degrees of duration, must needs force thinking men to look in the face the possibility of an overthrow of the temporal power in the present day, resulting in a triumphant return for the Bishop of Rome. And then the further question will arise, whether, if the Pope could be got to accept any reasonable compromise, and to sanction in Italy things which have already been sanctioned in France and Belgium, it might not be better, in the long run, for the peace of Europe and the interests of Christianity, that Italy should, if possible, make terms with him.

Nor can we put out of sight an argument employed, indeed, by Dr. Newman, but urged several years since by the Marquis Massimo d’Azeglio, and recently referred to in connexion with

<sup>1</sup> ‘France under Richelieu and Colbert. By J. H. Bridges, M.B. late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.’ (Edinburgh, Edmonston and Douglas, 1866.) Mr. Froude is said by the newspapers to have recently delivered a lecture intensely eulogistic of the mediæval Church.

his honoured name by a paper which treats Italian questions with special force and knowledge—our contemporary the *Saturday Review*. We refer to the consideration whether, when the matter is viewed on the side of the Italian kingdom, Florence is not a far better capital than Rome could possibly be. When Azeglio first suggested Florence for the metropolis of the new kingdom, he was regarded as an amiable dreamer. The dream has been converted into a solid reality, and the wisdom of resting in the new capital is becoming a more widely-spread conviction.

Then, again (though these features are not alluded to by Dr. Newman), we wish, as honest penmen, to recognize again the beauty of some peculiarities of Rome, which have been before mentioned in this Review.<sup>1</sup> We like the outward decorum of the city. We admire the arrangement, though it may also have a dangerous side, whereby any poor man in Rome, who attends to his religious duties, as taught in that system, can always feel safe from the dread of starvation. Even the rules concerning medical students seem to us really intended for the good of their souls.

To return to the discourse before us. We have looked over it once more, and can only discover one portion which appears to call for any notice in this connexion. We refer to the ingenious parallel between the government of the Roman states under the Pope and the Theocracy of Israel in the time of the Judges. By all means let such weight as is due to this argument be assigned to it. Yet, after duly pondering it to the best of our ability, the question still recurs, Is it seriously intended by the defenders of the Papal temporalities that they ought to rest contented with the admission that the government of these states is probably inferior to that of most other European countries? In 1860, the only French prelate of striking literary ability, Mgr. Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans, wrote a defence of the Papal sovereignty, which was pronounced by Pius IX. to be the best which had appeared. Now, Bishop Dupanloup entirely abjured the line of defence which seems to be shadowed forth in Dr. Newman's elaborate comparison. On the contrary, he maintained that the lands of the Church ought to be more prosperous and better governed than others: '*Si la perfection doit se rencontrer sur la terre quelque part, ce doit être dans les états de l'Eglise.*' The same prelate also frankly acknowledged that those 'who, under the pretence of dogmas, maintain that the Pope ought not to put his government in harmony with the exigencies of modern times, and the legitimate wishes of the people, declare thereby that the destruction of the Papal government is inevitable.'

<sup>1</sup> *Ubi supra*, No. for April, 1862, pp. 289, 290.

There are other portions of Dr. Newman's sermon, which, however interesting and really edifying in themselves, yet take us into regions beyond the reach of argument. Our meaning will be best understood if we consider one remarkable passage from an opposite point of view.

Let us suppose, then, for a moment that we were considering some statement of the sins and shortcomings of Great Britain; such, for example, as the powerful article published, some two years since, in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, under the title of 'The Decay of Pharisaism.' Let a Roman Catholic discuss with us the amount of truth contained in this scourging manifesto. He will probably end his remarks by saying, 'The cause lying at the root of all these evils is your religious isolation: submit to Rome, and your difficulties will be wonderfully lightened.' Now if, in the course of a rejoinder, we should say that it is not religious isolation, or any cognate cause, that is the source of our ills, but that they may be mainly resolved into the persistent malice of the rebellious archangel, what would be our opponent's reply? Surely of this sort, that we had changed the *venue*, and placed the entire question out of the reach of discussion. Of a like nature must be our reply, when, in terms of much force and beauty, the author of this discourse describes Satanic craft as the *fons et origo* of the Italian difficulty. He cannot find 'the sufficient explanation of the present confusion' (p. 31) in any merely human faults. Here people will differ. As Christians, we feel grateful to any writer who tries to impress upon our minds a sense of those agencies of the world unseen which most of us, even among those who admit their existence with the lips, are far too ready to forget. But it would be the merest hypocrisy for us to pretend that we can conscientiously accept this verdict. Not that we doubt for a moment—how, with the teaching of Holy Scripture and the Church before us, can we doubt?—but that the apostate angels would be found, if our eyes could pierce the veil, to be working grievous mischief everywhere, alike in Italy and in England. But the natural conflict between the Papacy and the forms and ideas of modern civilization, the facts which we have recounted, and those which we shall yet have to recount, go much further, in our judgment, towards the explanation of this confusion than Dr. Newman is willing to admit. In speaking thus, we by no means intend to imply that the faults lie wholly on one side. We do not suppose that the people of Rome and the Romagna, or of Italy at large, are all saints and sages, or that they have never been in any respect unreasonable. But, whatever may have been their faults, we still consider that they have been far more sinned against than sinning.

We quit the consideration of this discourse for a time, in order

that we may supply more evidence from the works at the head of this article.

When Pope Pius VII. was put in repossession of the states of the Church by the Congress of Vienna, Cardinal Consalvi commenced a *régime* very different from that experienced by the towns under Papal rule before the epoch of the French Revolution. These towns had previously possessed very considerable liberties, each being, in great measure, governed by its own municipality. That certain advantages had accrued from French domination was perceived and admitted by Consalvi: the excellent state of the finances showed this. But it was a grievous disappointment to these towns to discover that, in losing certain admitted benefits of French rule, they were not to gain back their ancient amount of freedom. The cardinal-secretary determined, in an unfortunate hour, to attempt the carrying out of the French system of centralization. But it is not every one who can bend the bow of Ulysses. French methods of governing needed for their success the organizing powers of French laity; and the Romagna, which had thus lost much and gained nothing, sank into one continuous chronic state of insurrection.

In the year 1846, one of those outbreaks occurred in the ancient city known in classic and ecclesiastical story as Ariminum, and to the readers of Dante as the place

‘ Su la marina, dove ’l Po discende  
Per aver pace co’ seguaci sui.’

This insurrection in Rimini was on many accounts to be regretted and condemned; but the further question arises, In what manner was it put down, and how were the delinquents treated? These questions were discussed, in a moderately-sized pamphlet, by the Marquis Massimo d’Azeglio.

Azeglio, who was born at Turin, in 1798, had already distinguished himself, both in the realm of literature and of art. Several of his paintings, specially one called ‘The Origin of the House of Sforza,’ had won the highest praise from the lips of good judges. He had married the daughter of the illustrious Manzoni, author of ‘I Promessi Sposi;’ and had emulated the fame of his father-in-law by those beautiful tales of ‘Ettore Fieramosca,’ and of ‘Niccolo de’ Lapi,’ which were first, we believe, made known to the English public in the pages of this Review.

There are few living critics of whom it may not be with reason be asked, Who are you, that you should venture to enter into controversy with Dr. Newman? We are deeply conscious of the weight and force of the considerations implied in such a question: but thus much may be urged upon our behalf. We say to our readers, Throw on one side, if you will, as mere sur-



plusage, all reflections which are simply ours. Read only, if you choose, the evidence laid before you in the shape of extracts, and form your opinion for yourselves. If piety, genius, sincerity, learning, and power of expression have a claim on your attention, undoubtedly these gifts summon you to become listeners on the one side. We submit that they are all to be found on the other side likewise, as in the case of others among our witnesses, so pre-eminently in that of Massimo d'Azeglio. Further, without wishing to give needless offence, we must own that, despite Dr. Newman's protest on this score, there *does* seem to us to be a freedom of movement on the part of men brought up in a system which is rarely found in those who have become converts to it; and, even if this point of difference be waived, there still remains a balance, in the instance before us, on the side of a writer who had spent many of the best years of his life in Rome, as compared with one whose sojourn there has been comparatively short.

This pamphlet was dedicated to Count Cesare Balbo. It was entitled 'On the Recent Events in Romagna, Reflections by Massimo d'Azeglio' (*Degli ultimi casi di Romagna, Riflessioni di Massimo d'Azeglio*). Not having ever seen any portion of this work in an English dress, and knowing how small is the proportion of those among us who study Italian, we are about to transfer to our pages a very large portion of this *brochure*. Let not him who would study these questions be daunted at its length. Much as it must inevitably lose by translation, in respect of force and gracefulness, there remains, if we mistake not, an assemblage of those qualities which the Stagirite deemed to constitute the chief means towards conviction; namely, the sense of moral weight on the part of the speaker, the evocation of pathetic sentiments in the mind of the hearer, and, lastly, the influence of fair and persuasive argument.

'Before proceeding to prove my assertions [that the insurrections in the Romagna were ill-timed, injurious to their cause, and therefore blameable], I feel constrained to explain how much it has pained me to use that last adjective, and how I have only been able to compel myself to use it after long and grave deliberating.

'The raising of my voice to utter words of blame to men, my fellow-citizens, whom I do believe have been led into error, but who are very far from deserving the evil accusations of the official papers, who, on the contrary, possess the undeniable merit of having exercised that most difficult virtue, the virtue of sacrifice, and who have risked their lives, and all most dear to man, for what they believed would benefit their country: the grieving of *them*, now that their situation (sad enough before) is even worse, now that they are suffering, now that they eat the bitter bread of the vanquished and the exiled, costs me real pain, as it is my nature always to favour the conquered more than the conqueror, and also because I think there is no viler deed can be done on earth than to cast a stone at the fallen. But I feel in my conscience that it is no such act I am committing

in writing these lines—I feel that I am solely moved by the desire to say that which I believe is beneficial to our common cause, by the desire to say the truth, with all the moderation and impartiality that my soul is capable of. . . . I think, then, that these revolts, partial and local as they have ever been (except the 1821), are useless. . . . they waste the most vital elements of the Italian people; men of the bravest hearts, of the greatest energy, and highest intellect, are lost to us by them, are constrained either to abandon their country altogether, or to remain in it beneath the weight of an injurious pardon, being held as it were in quarantine and reduced to the most perfect inaction.

‘I believe that these miniature revolutions, though productive of heavy sorrow in the restricted districts where they occur, are hardly perceived out of Italy, and so have no effect on the supreme tribunal of public opinion, now spread over all the world; and would to God they *were* only unobserved, or even *only* blamed and condemned. But they are derided, scorned. They serve as a theme for slight newspaper articles, full either of patronizing pity, or of sardonic admonitions, which make the blood boil more than any abuse: and the foreign reader smiles and passes on: and the opinion that we are a helpless people, a people destitute of sound ideas, of any sort of political education, and incapable of the long and patient labour which alone can produce a nation’s regeneration, is confirmed and spread: that we are alike incapable of suffering or resisting, and therefore deserve our present position. And shall we then be so low fallen, that the misery, the tears, and the blood of Italy shall be but a subject for laughter? . . .

‘As the thread of my essay is unfolded, it appears even more and more clear (as I said in the first page), that *opportuneness* is everything in political affairs. . . . and that if I prove the movement at Rimini inopportune, I prove its injuriousness and blameability.

‘As I have begun with this arrangement of my subject (which is perhaps not quite useless for the orderly exposition of my ideas), I will adhere to it to the end: but now, when I am on the point of turning towards those who were the cause of the useless shedding of Italian blood, when I am on the point of asking them their right to do that, I repeat it, one thought causes my heart to ache, the idea that these my words may very likely reach the ears of those who are even now paying the cost of an error of judgment (I will not call it a crime or a sin) by enduring that most bitter of human miseries, exile: that words of mine, perhaps, may make more sorrowful the sorrowing vigils of the banished, of him who has offered as a holocaust to his country, the quiet converse of his fellow-citizens, of his native roof; all his home happiness, the love of mother, wife, children: of him, who voluntarily robbed himself of all these, and (along with his own life) threw them into the scale where our fate already trembled in the balance: of him who now listens for every breath that comes from his native Italy, hoping that, in return for so much sacrifice, one word may perhaps some time reach him of comfort, of sympathy, perhaps even of praise.

‘And I am to be the one to send into his ear (and, far worse, into his heart), words of blame!

‘Yes. I deem it useful, I deem it (for myself) even a debt of honour, and more than one Italian will think me right.

‘Not that I presumptuously think that I am the absolute interpreter of truth; but I believe, and I think I may believe, that I have the right to lay before others the results of my reflections: I believe it useful to provoke discussion; and my warmest wish is, that some mind, far higher and clearer than mine, may reply to this in writing, may point out my mistakes, and show us better and wiser resolutions; I would bless the hand

that would give us other thoughts, not perceived by me, but more calculated to benefit the cause of Italy.

‘But if the authors of the movement at Rimini have, under their sufferings, let indignation and impatience lead them to acts which must be considered untimely and injurious, and therefore blameable, are we therefore to condemn them altogether and absolutely?’

‘At this point I thank God that I have fulfilled the painful task of grieving the vanquished and the unhappy, and that now I may turn to the victor, to him who has no dungeon to endure, no exile’s misery; to him who is powerful, and enjoys every favour of fortune: and I feel now that my words come more freely, more confidently.’

‘But before I examine into the manner in which the Court of Rome has treated its subjects, specially those in the Romagna; before any discussion of its acts, I would know whether discussion be possible; I mean, whether we are to argue on premisses held equally binding for both parties: so first, I inquire, whether there be but one Decalogue, one Holy Gospel, one only moral code, given alike to all men as a guide for their actions; or whether there are to be held to be two editions of the above said code, one for the use of princes, the other for their subjects; one for rulers, statesmen, and diplomatists; another for the multitude beneath their rule?’

‘I will myself venture to reply to this question, and will decide that the Court of Rome doubtless holds that there is only one code for all, ruled and rulers, strong and weak. But this is not all. Another matter remains to be settled; and this is, whether, to this moral code, to this rule (universally to be followed) the axiom may be applied, that every rule has its exception; or whether these rules of justice and humanity are not the only ones which *man never has a right on any pretext to disobey*. This query, also, I (anticipating the decision of the Romish Court) will answer, favourably to the latter assertion. Being agreed on these two points, . . . discussion becomes possible, and one only matter is left for investigation, that is, what consequences does the Court of Rome draw from these premisses, and what does (not I, who am as nothing) but what does the public opinion and judgment of the whole civilized world infer? . . .

‘These arguments and instances seem to me to prove . . . that *injustice* is absolutely and inevitably condemned; and that no state reasons, no excuses of public utility, nor any other motive, can ever justify it.

‘Such ideas as these seem so purely elementary, that my readers will marvel that I should give myself the inconvenience of writing them: and, certainly, it does seem like dreaming, to be forced to take up the subject in this manner from first principles, which would seem to need no demonstration, but to be able to be taken for granted.

‘But how else can one begin a discussion with him, who, whilst he entitles himself (to the world) the “Announcer of Glad Tidings,” makes them so sorrowful to those most immediately confided to his care by God?—with him who is the guardian and teacher of the divine code of justice, love, and pardon, but who commits, or at least permits, injustice, converts love into hatred, and has never pardoned?—with him who preaches humility from a throne, charity whilst shutting his ears to every entreaty, and brotherly love by means of atrocious military commissions? If these men be asked, “In God’s name, do you believe in justice, or do you not?” “Do you, or do you not, believe what you preach?” they have no right to take it ill, and no one on earth will wonder at the questions.

‘And these harsh words, be it observed, I do not write from any enmity to the Papacy, and I say this solemnly, before proceeding any further, lest my readers should be under any delusion. I venerate Christianity, I venerate Catholicism, and I trust earnestly that the religious unity of

Italy may never be disturbed—the last unity she possesses. Moreover, I have no dislike or aversion against the Court of Rome, from whom I never received the smallest annoyance, and, on the contrary, have enjoyed many favours. My words, however severe, are not expressive of the hatred of an enemy, but rather of the sorrow which rises in our heart for a friend whom we see bent on self-destruction.

‘I have accused the Papal government of injustice. Suppose it were to say to me—“What would you have me do?” I should make a reply alike unexpected by it or my reader: I should beg of it a favour that could scarce seem indiscreet: I should implore it, on behalf of its subjects, the grace of being a little more absolute, a little more despotic than it is now; or rather, I should say, to *be* a government both absolute and despotic, in *reality*—as now it only thinks it is. . . .

‘There are two ways of exercising approximately absolute power. The first consists in making others do what you are unable to do yourself, *i.e.*, by investing others with a portion of your own authority, and leaving them to exercise it at their discretion. . . . This mode is in use in Turkey, and even there it is diminishing as civilization increases; but it is not diminishing amongst Christians in some countries, and most especially in the Papal states. This is a mode, above all others, ruinous to the subjects, and full of peril to the prince, who does not rule really, and therefore has not the benefits of empire, but gets all the hatred and responsibilities of it; for where the men whom he has invested with power misuse it, the prince is necessarily accused of cruelty, if he does not correct them, and of folly if he does; as he thus confesses that he has not chosen his ministers well—contempt or hatred, one or the other, it is impossible but he should incur.

‘This happens every day under the Pontifical rule; and only to cite one instance out of thousands, I will mention a fact most recent, and which all will recollect. Not a year since, a bishop in the Papal states published an edict with some new regulations touching matrimony, with heavy penalties annexed for all who should disobey it. I was at Rome. The edict travelled from pocket to pocket, from *conversazione* to *conversazione*, and I cannot describe the laughter it occasioned. The government was compelled to annul it (after every effort to save the reputation of the bishop), as it was the maddest document in the world. But it may easily be imagined what effect such affairs as that have upon a government’s credit: and in the Roman state they are continually happening. . . .

‘There is a second way of exercising absolute power, the best and sole practicable way. . . .

‘This way is most simple, and consists in this: let the prince of his act and deed (by divine inspiration, if you like to have it so, for I will not quarrel about words), let him decide, once for all, what are his wishes and desires, and let him express those in so many laws and regulations, and say to his subjects, “*from the least to the greatest of you, all shall obey them equally.*” . . .

‘I ask now, can the Pope say he does this? I ask his subjects, whether it would not be far better for *them* if he could? I ask the Romagnols if they would not gladly obey good laws, or bad, if they were but settled, without exception of persons, equal for all, rather than be under the more arbitrary will of their *Monsignori*, legates, vice-legates, delegates, and what not? . . .

‘I have declared my determination to speak the truth without reticence, without passion, and I find myself compelled to praise Austria. Her code (except with respect to political offences, in which cases it is absolutely detestable), is alike for all, and the meanest porter may get justice against the greatest noble. . . .

‘And I say that men will bear many, and even heavy evils, when they see that there is a certain, sure, and equal rule for all. Contented or discontented, they resign themselves. But they do never resign themselves to see (for example) in the case of two delinquents, the one absolved, the other condemned, for the same offence—to see the priest go free from the punishment which inexorably strikes the layman. They will never resign themselves to a life of perpetual suspicion, to an uncertainty of every moment, to the torturing and ceaseless doubt as to whether they may not be despoiled of their property, imprisoned, or arbitrarily injured in any possible way, without a chance of appeal, and without any stated law to defend them.

‘Austria knows this well, and, alas, tries to make her own use of it . . . and if she has not succeeded in her attempt, it is, thanks to the generous nature of the Romagnols, to their national and deeply Italian spirit, which has induced them to continue to bear all their miseries patiently rather than annex themselves to the foreigner, to the greatest enemy of their native country: but, on the other side, it must be confessed that the Pontifical government has done all in its power to reduce them to that grievous step.

‘To have a code (and by code I understand not merely laws, but certain and fixed institutions) is the first duty of every government, whatever may be its form; it is, therefore, the first duty of the Papal government; and if its subjects beg for this, they beg for what is just; and if the governments refuse it, they commit an iniquity.

‘But if they have no law or settled order, general and equal for all; since they are compelled to live, I ought to say to struggle on as best they may, trying to defend themselves perpetually against the hundred authorities which attack them in every way (and which are mutually quarrelling among themselves at the same time), if these poor wretches had any way of raising their voice, and of being heard when their sufferings get beyond endurance, if there were a door that would open to them anywhere, or an ear that would listen!

I will now say a thing which will appear monstrous, impossible, in this year 1846; so he who knows not Rome will believe it a calumny.

The head of the Roman Church has no day of public audience like all other absolute monarchs. But this is nothing. If a subject of the Papal states begs for an interview with the Pope, it is never granted till he has formally promised not to mention any *business*!

Such a fact needs no comment, and those who do not believe it, are most welcome to verify it for themselves. And if some one should reply to me that it is allowable to present memorials, to appeal to the tribunals, to the governors, to the legates, to the secretaries of state, &c., I should thank that excellent man for his information, and I should also thank God on his behalf, that He had never sent him troubles that could show him by experience how much dependence can be placed on those resources.

‘In short, either my accusations are calumnies (and in this case let them be proved such), or it is the truth, that he who preaches justice and is its highest guardian, is himself guilty of injustice, and that it is only reasonable to ask him whether there are two Gospels, two moral codes, or only one; whether he believes himself, what he preaches or not. . . . Whether he thinks it possible, in our days, to establish and maintain any authority whatever on the flagrant and perpetual denial of its principles; whether there is in this world any one man who has a right to act unrighteously against every other one; whether it is not too absurd to expect us all to endure this peacefully, and to resign ourselves to the infinite evils it produces. It is reasonable to say to him, “For the revoltings in Romagna,

for the deaths, the exiles, the tears of so many unhappy human beings, you are responsible. You will have to give an account before God, and not your trampled-down subjects. Their blood will fall back upon your head, their sorrows, their tears, will be judged at that tribunal which no crowns, sceptres, or tiaras ever yet reached, but only naked souls, not protected from the sword of Eternal Justice by any shield but that of their own innocence. Your works will be weighed in those incorruptible scales, where the lightest injury done to the meanest human creature will weigh more than all the thrones and crowns in the universe.

“Either what you teach of God’s justice and His tremendous future judgments in another world is false (and then my words are vain, and you would do ill to mind them), or what you teach is true, and you believe it, and you believe that God will one day ask you to answer for your deeds, will say to you, ‘*I gave you a people, what did you do with them?*’ And then tell me by what name you will call your rule over them, tell me how there is to be found any justification of your proceedings; tell me, for I for my part am utterly unable to discover or divine any.” . . .

“These are stern words, . . . but they are also words of grief, words of love rather than anger, for I see so large a portion of that Italy which I love above every other earthly thing, placed by you in the grievous alternative of either enduring all the misery you can inflict, or of rising in armed resistance, and so certainly falling into the hands either of your executioners or those of the foreigner.

“They are words forced from me by truth and justice, and if, after saying to the Romagnols, ‘You have not known how to endure,’ I did not say to their rulers at Rome, ‘You have sinned grievously against them,’ what name should I deserve?

“My accusation against the Papal government, that it has never given its subjects any code by which they were to be judged, includes all others. But I have used words far too severe not to feel bound to show more in detail than I have yet done, that I have not spoken them without the fullest justification: to do this, I must enter more fully into this saddest subject. I must uncover the many wounds inflicted on those beautiful provinces which are as wretched as they are lovely, I must produce *facts*, and although this will make this little work longer than I could have wished, I cannot avoid it consistently with my own honour. . . .

“The general economic system of the Roman state, and its finances, are reduced to such a pitch that all Europe fully knows its utter absurdity and imminent ruin. . . .

“Its strictly prohibitive regulations fetter both importation and exportation, by exaggerated duties, . . . by foolish prohibitions, which, instead of favouring the nation’s industry, favour the monopoly of a few, stop both labour and production, and encourage smuggling (that fertile source of all corruption and immorality), and are injurious to the government itself, as this maintains a class of men ever ready to join in any scheme of opposition.

“The effect of this system is to make all the subjects of the states pay much more than their real price for every article they consume, to the injury not only of their own interests, but also of those of the treasury itself, and to the profit of a few individuals. In a word, it impoverishes all to enrich a very few; and to heighten the absurdity of such a system, the taxes are all farmed (whilst in every well-ordered state public works are farmed, but all duties are administered on economic principles), so that the large majority of the consumers are losers, and impoverished by all the gains and riches of the tax farmers.

“Of anything by which the public wealth might be augmented, the



government will not hear one word ; it beholds in everything a plot, a rebellion, a danger, but it does not see the greatest and most inevitable danger of all : like a man, who should run away (looking behind him at it the while) from an insect, and not know that he is rushing towards a precipice.

Rome has said : " I do not believe in railroads," and all Europe laughs at this profession of faith ; but the Pontifical subjects do not laugh.

Their government opposes in every way everything which might cause some small improvement : allows no bank institutions (that might improve the public credit), except the Roman bank : no associations, either industrial or agricultural. . . . The agricultural proprietors, crushed beneath the weight of enormous taxes (and moreover having no outlets for their produce) are being hopelessly ruined. Trade may be said to have no existence at all, and the central state of Italy, seated on two seas . . . has two ports, Civit  Vecchia and Ancona, . . . in neither of which is a vessel ever seen save by chance some foreign steamboat and a few wretched fishing boats.

A trifling incident happened to myself when in Ancona very recently. I wished to hire a boat by the hour, that I might sketch the town from the water. I asked a couple of boatmen how much they would take me for, and (accustomed to the extravagant demands of Genoa, Livorno, Naples, and other Italian ports) I expected to be asked at least a scudo an hour. The men asked "*two paoli*," and that with deprecating look and gestures, "*trusting I did not think them unreasonable.*" They little thought, poor fellows, that pity made my heart bleed to hear their answer, for it revealed the misery and poverty of a whole people !

But if the government, whilst it forbids its subjects not only to enrich, but even only to help themselves, at the same time prevented their being ruined, oppressed by exorbitant taxes : if it would but spend with moderation itself !

The very opposite to this is so notoriously the case, that it would be a useless lengthening of these pages to prove it.

Speaking generally, the worse the quality of any merchandise may be, the cheaper it may be bought. But this is not true of governments. The worse *they* are, the dearer their price. And the Pontifical subjects know this well for they have not merely to pay (as all must) for a government to rule them whatever that may cost, they also must blindly pay the bills of an improvident rule which is exhausting them ; they must maintain a perfect army of useless *employ s*. (Would that they were *only* useless !)

They are compelled to pay exalted ministers enormous salaries, and these are usually foreigners, who fill places, none of which can be obtained by native citizens without entering Holy Orders, whether they have any vocation for the sacred ministry or not : the places which may be held by laymen being all so badly paid, that no man can get a decent maintenance from them.

But of all the evils of the Papal government, the most grievous to the people is that of the Swiss mercenaries. I am not speaking of the Swiss guards of the Pontifical palace, who are too few to be of any importance ; I speak of the Swiss regiments, who offer to our eyes in these modern days the sorrowful spectacle of the old "*Free Companies*," grievous and strange in these days. . . .

The Papal government has no idea what an accumulation of hatred (God grant, not of vengeance !) it is gathering up against itself, not merely in the people, but in the army, by keeping up this curse of foreign and mercenary forces. They would assuredly have been attacked (and dispersed) long since, by the Romagnols, but that these last are well aware that they are but the advanced guard of Austria, and that they would

vanish the instant she ceased to watch behind their shoulder. . . . The native troops, ill-paid, ragged, and actually often dressed only in the cast-off garments of these foreign mercenaries, thirst for revenge against them, as appears evidently from the constant quarrels between them. . . .

'The cost of these foreigners is incredible, their insatiability, their ceaseless demands on the government; and even more incredible is the folly of the government in satisfying their boundless greed. . . .

'Thus is the money expended which is extorted from the Papal subjects. But I proceed, for more remains to be told. If we had nothing worse than the Swiss! . . .

'There is another and far more wicked institution in the Romagnas, another dark and infamous power invisible to every eye, but which every citizen, in every place, and every moment of his existence, feels ever at his side, vigilant and ready to work him ill.

'The reader at these words utters doubtless the word "*Police*;" but the reader is wrong. I speak of a thing more evil than that; of an infamy that is newer, rarer, in fact which is altogether unknown in civilized nations. I speak of a thing whereof I dare not, will not, accuse the government, but which undeniably it is aware of, it knows of the existence of, and yet does not remove, from places where it (the government) is all-powerful.

'There is in the Romagnas a race of men, vile, obscure, of irregular and wicked lives, used to idleness, to drinking, to tavern riots, but who loudly shout out their fidelity to the Pope, to his government, to faith and religion, and by this boast keep themselves free from all restraint or law; deem all violence allowable (possibly, indeed, they deem it meritorious!) provided only it be exercised upon men of different opinions from theirs, which of course ends in meaning any one whom they may happen to dislike.

'This abominable tribe, profiting by the perpetual terrors in which the people live, combine in obscure *conventicole* (clubs, societies?) and there contrive imaginary conspiracies, delations, and worse than this, *vendette* and assassinations.

'The city and suburbs of Faenza are divided by a miserable and inveterate internal rivalry, probably a remnant of some ancient divisions. For the worn-out and disused party distinctions they have substituted those of "*Liberals*," for the city, and of "*Papalini*" for the suburbs. This last is peopled by men of brutal ferocity, ever ready for quarrels and bloodshed: it may be said to be the chief place of origin for all acts of violence, the principal nest of that infamous horde, who here (and similarly in the other cities of Romagna) provoke, strike, wound, and often kill (and this always safe from punishment) all those whom they please to call "*Liberals*," "*Freemasons*," or "*Carbonari*."

'Infinite numbers of cases have occurred from 1831 to this day, and are still daily happening.

'In 1831, during the Austrian occupation, a few peaceable citizens, returning late at night from some evening party, met some of these men, who first insulted them in words, then attacked them with sticks and knives. They were repelled several times by some Austrian officers, who although foreigners, although enemies, were indignant at such enormities, at the base connivance of the government, and could not bear to see quiet and unarmed men so ill-treated, but from mere humanity saw them safe out of the danger, and only left them at the doors of their own houses. . . .

'To think that in our times, now, whilst I write, all this is happening, (or may be happening) in a country governed specially in His Name of whom it is written, that "*He so loved mankind that He gave His life for them*," in the name of that law which tells us to forgive our brother seventy

times seven, i.e. always : only to reflect that this is no fable, no dream, no exaggeration of party spirit, but a thing which, unhappily for religion and humanity, is only too real and true ; is a thought to make one doubt even of the sun's light, and to bring desolation to the heart.

'Like a drowning man, who catches at a straw, I try to believe that the Pontiff does not know that such things as the above are committed in his name. Does not know ! Is that possible ? I shrink from answering. But, at all events, if *he* does not, his ministers know it well—at least some of them. Words worthy of such men I will not pronounce, or soil my pen by writing ; wherefore I add no syllable, but leave them to the execration of all honest men of every party and of every country.

'Let us leave these horrors : but, alas ! I have to touch on some as thoroughly wrong, though not perhaps so deeply infamous.

'I allude to trials and to political judgments, entrusted to extraordinary "commissions," which are bound by no legal mode of procedure, and have unlimited authority to condemn. In these tribunals (veritable "*cut-throats*," as the French say), abominated by all civilized nations, instruments of princes' vengeance, not of justice ; in these tribunals, I say, the same men are judges and accusers ; there is no freedom of defence, no choice of a defender who is given by the tribunal and devoted to it : . . . moral (and one might truly say material) torture is employed ; . . . opinions, thoughts, feelings, expressed in some hasty words, or in some imprudent writing, are punished with penalties surpassing all ideas of proportion or justice, even supposing the accused to be guilty.

'When one considers the moderation of the tribunals in civilized countries, of France, or England, or Belgium, their scrupulous and even timid anxiety on behalf of the accused, . . . when, for instance, one beholds Louis Napoleon set free after the attempt at Strasbourg (whereas had he been a subject of the Pope's, there would hardly have been gibbets enough found to hang him upon), and when one considers by whom those states are ruled, and who rules the Roman state : when one recollects that those states are styled contemptuously "heretical," and "irreligious ;" that their institutions are called bad and perverting to the human mind, and that these (in the Roman state) are declared so excellent and holy ; when we behold the effects of both, human reason would totter, had not God in His mercy placed in the human heart the faculty of knowing and loving the truth and justice, and of detesting lying and iniquity. . . .

'Experience has shown that the savages who consent to hold these tribunals are aware of the desires of those who place them there ; they seek, and determine to find, guilt, not innocence ; they know that every condemnation raises them in the esteem of their government, whilst every acquittal lowers them. They know that for *them* the steps to honour and rewards are the bodies of their victims, and that it is of little importance whether they be really guilty or innocent. Thanks to the press, the world is now well acquainted with the atrocities perpetrated by these men : the names of the most notorious of them stand marked by universal execration. . . . And after this are we still to see "Special Commissions ?"

'The opposing and denouncing of such abominations would be a superfluity in any civilized country ; it is, alas, no superfluity in Italy ! I, who desire above every other thing to observe a scrupulous truthfulness, and who would not utter a falsehood to save a world, will relate things which I did not indeed actually see, but which on soundest reasons I hold to be true, and which also are held so by every one amongst us. If, notwithstanding all my care, I should happen to accuse unjustly, either an individual or the government itself, . . . the smallest, humblest, and weakest of mankind—if he can show me that I have spoken unjustly of him—shall have full reparation

from me, and whilst I retract the injustice I may have fallen into (unintentionally) concerning him, I shall thank him for having so served the cause of truth and equity. But the greatest and most powerful of living men shall not make me unsay one single syllable if I justly accused him.

‘In the summer and autumn of 1843, in Romagna, perpetual increasing vexations and extortions caused a slight emotion in the populations. . . . Some poor little traders and artisans fled to the mountains. . . . In Bologna there was great compassion felt for those poor creatures, as it was well known their act was caused by the intolerable arrangement of the taxes, but no agitation of any sort was shown in the city. This did not suit the police at all ; it being an old art of theirs to imagine, or even to instigate, demonstrations adverse to the government, that they might make their profit out of them. So they represented the state of affairs as a political agitation, and at once commenced prosecutions, domiciliary visits, imprisonments, without real guilt or any grounds of proof ; hence numbers fled, in terror of being suddenly imprisoned. Of course these had to join the former in the mountains. . . . The fear of seizure spread so much, that men of high position and of the first families in the city, feeling their lives and liberty in imminent danger, preferred to fly to those poor men, and to aid them with their means and advice to avoid the galleys or the gibbet.

‘Meantime, in Bologna, the Commissions condemned numbers to long imprisonments, and put to death seven or eight. Of the means used for proving any species of guilt nothing was known, trials and defences being alike secret and unknown. . . .

‘The Legation of Forl, governed then by Cardinal Gizi (to whose humanity and generosity it is a happiness to bear testimony), offered no scope to the activity of the Commission ; the Cardinal’s mildness and moderation preserving perfect tranquillity.

‘In Ravenna, on the other hand, the Cardinal-Legate Massimi (a Roman prince, known and detested universally for his harshness and arrogance, who had excited the unbounded hatred of the citizens by his open and continued persecutions, by his arbitrary vexations and punishments) : in Ravenna the Commission thought its operations would be most successful, under the auspices and favour of the Cardinal, who was easily aroused to anger, to implacable vengeance, and stupid terrors.

‘The people having been exasperated by a succession of unjust and violent deeds, and their patience put to the severest proof, an event occurred which no provocation could make defensible, but which under such circumstances can assuredly cause no surprise. A Swiss and a carabineer, who had both been conspicuous for their acts of violence and cruelty, were killed ; and this gave the Commission an excuse for extending its action over the whole of the wretched Romagna.

‘This was in 1845. . . . Multitudes were imprisoned. The *supposed* opinions of any examinee were held sufficient for his incarceration. That this was the case, is proved by the infinity of *liberations* still taking place, after months, and in some cases even years, of imprisonment, undergone by persons whom the Commission itself perforce must admit, at last, to have been guiltless.

‘The physical tortures, the moral surprises, and other iniquitous means made use of to extort confessions or revelations, are a saddening and sorrowful history. . . .

‘In the most burning hours of day, on the dust-covered roads of Romagna, was seen slowly advancing a long file of carts, guarded by carabineers and *shirri*, on which were bound the political examinees (*Inquisiti*) whom the Commission was moving from one dungeon to another.

Those were not men accustomed to hardships; they were refined persons of all ages, of all ranks, and the larger part of them innocent even in the eyes of the government. I leave the reader to imagine with what feelings they were seen to traverse the cities in that condition—dirty, dust-covered, burnt by the sun, bound, and treated as highway robbers. It may truly be said of him who uses such means as that to strike terror into a people, as brave and generous as are the Romagnols, that God has taken away his reason and blinded his eyes!

‘All this, however, was vain, as nothing could be extorted by tortures or sufferings from wretched people who told nothing merely because they knew nothing to tell. The judges, despairing, were continually hurrying from the dungeons to the Cardinal (so says one who was then in Bologna), telling him the impossibility of getting anything proved; and the Cardinal urged them to *spend*, to use every art and every effort to succeed. At last, failing wholly to find either conspiracy, plot, or political guilt, by putting together analogies of long-past events and present ones, doubtful evidence of unknown witnesses, and by mixing together smuggling and state offences, a trial was concocted, on which the Commission condemned two persons to death, and numbers to twenty, fifteen, and ten years of the galleys!

‘One noble and generous action came to console the universal suffering in that sad time. These Commissions always entrust the defence of the prisoners to some one devoted to themselves and the government. In those cases, it was given to a lawyer of Forlì, named Ulisse Pantoli, of well-known devotion to the Papal government. But he was too honest and truthful to lend his aid on such an occasion: on the contrary, he became the warm and active defender of the unhappy victims. . . .

‘The Commission and the Cardinal (enraged by this virtuous temerity) imprisoned him. . . .

‘The reader will be as weary of reading so much iniquity, as I am of writing it; but one last fact remains, and he and I must endure our weariness for the truth’s sake, which ought to be made known.

‘One of the prisoners accused of having a hand in the death of the carabineer had, by chance, slept in the country on the night of the homicide, and had also slept in the same room with a friar.

‘To prove his innocence, he produced the testimony of this friar, who declared that the thing was true; and who, for giving that evidence, was severely reprimanded, recalled to Rome, and imprisoned in a monastery! . . .

‘In such condition were the Legations, when, in the summer of this year (1846), the little troop of fugitives, who had taken refuge in the republic of San Marino, heard that that refuge was no longer to be permitted them. . . . The Pope vehemently threatened the little republic, which had no power to resist, and the exiles were nearly reduced to despair by scarcity and want. In this condition, they seemed to have hoped that in an armed struggle something might perchance occur to enable them to escape from the net in which they were caught. They marched towards Rimini. . . .

‘A French newspaper, *La Presse*, . . . has said that “the quiet attitude of the remainder of the Papal States during the revolt of Rimini proves that the Papal subjects are happy and contented.”

‘But the *Presse* is wrong. Be it known to Europe, that Romagna, and the rest of the Papal States, remained tranquil, not because they are satisfied with their present rulers, but because there is in those populations sufficient courage and patriotism to induce them to endure all their ills with patience, rather than run the risk, by resistance, of calling down

greater evils on their country—most especially that greatest of all evils, foreign intervention.

‘Let Europe also know that the revolt at Rimini was made by men who were reduced to not having one yard of earth whereon they could put their foot in safety—by men who could never be sure when they retired to rest that they would not be awoken in the middle of the night by *shirri*—by men kept in ceaseless uncertainty as to both liberty and life; and every one is aware that, when brought to such a state as that, men will do and dare anything, in the hope of changing it, or getting out of it.

‘The official and paid papers published the most shameful and infamous falsehoods concerning the actions of the men of Rimini during their short rule—shameful and infamous, because he who is powerful ought to be content with his power, and ashamed to descend to fraud and lies. All the best citizens unite in witnessing that the insurgents observed the most perfect moderation and justice; and it is an atrocious calumny to say that they touched the money either of individuals or of the city.

‘Romagna, and all the remainder of the Pontifical States, remained tranquil; and their rulers might say, as was said in a similar case of Poland, “*L'ordre règne à Varsovie.*” But let them not reckon too much on that tranquillity. The Papal government will not obtain real and lasting tranquillity by means of its new tribunals of the *Sacra Consulta*, just introduced to do away with the unbearable scandal of the “Commissions,” but which in point of fact are precisely similar to those, both as regards their doings and the persons of whom they are composed. It will not obtain it by a system of terror, or by the imprisonments that are daily becoming more frequent in the Legations, although all those who had been concerned in the late disturbances had long since left the country. It will not obtain it by its brutal treatment of its political prisoners, whom it treats like robbers and assassins, and most cruelly chains together with such men, contrary to the custom of modern civilized nations; so that men of high character, who are respected for their talents, for their rank, for their irreproachable conduct,—who are regretted and desired, not merely by their own families, but by whole cities,—are now enduring the hourly contact of the vilest wretches in Civit  Vecchia, S. Leo, Forte Urbano, and Civit  Castellana; the greater number without any proof of guilt—some having, during long years of imprisonment, never as much as seen the face of an examiner or a judge. I only assert what is universally known. But it may obtain it by justice, by love, by pardon—all which it preaches, but never practises; it may obtain it by (for once) practising itself that Holy Law it undertakes to teach. Foreign arms—that is to say, Austrian intervention—keep it on foot, indeed, in a material and violent manner; but this only (like the mercenaries) shows that it has no kind of hold on the regard of its subjects; and, moreover, renders the pontifical government odious to the Italians, daily more anxious for independence, and seeing daily renewed that ancient sin of the Papacy, the calling in the arms of the foreigner to use them against Italians; whilst outside Italy, it is an evil sight to all good men, even to the most devoted Catholics, to see Austria, as it were, hold Romagna by the hair of her head, that the Pope may use her as he will. Hence it is, that not only Protestants and others who are opposed to Rome, but the very Catholics most devoted and attached to her, even the clergy themselves (except those who are bound by their private interest), have lost all respect for the temporal power of the Pope, and proclaim it dangerous to the Faith and to religion. . . .

‘We have seen that the government of the Papal states is injurious to the people; but it contains in itself a worse evil—i.e. a total inaptness and repugnance to any amelioration. . . . Some reforms were promised after



the events of 1831. That promise was not kept, and for that there is no defence; it only made more evident the need of effacing the primary blot of injustice, then made still darker by bad faith. . . .

‘But if the present order of things cannot be fundamentally changed . . . why, in the name of common sense, need Rome forbid her learned men to attend the annual Scientific Congresses? Why should she see a peril where even Austria herself sees none?’

‘Why not give up the disgraceful gains of the lottery? I know—because of financial reasons. But is it not too shameful a thing to behold the head of our religion holding open the door to a vice so corrupting and so dangerous, when all civilized nations have closed it?’ Would it not be a far greater gain, in every point of view, for Rome to restrict her expenditure, close her lottery, and thus to acquire some credit for acting consistently with those principles of morality and honesty which she professes to teach?

‘Why, also, does the Government oppose, either openly or underhand, every effort that may be made to improve the instruction and education of the people? I know, and will say at once: because in all those efforts it sees one vast design of the Liberals for changing the conditions of the State. But is it not too shameful that, whilst open war is waged against Aporti, his “Manual,” and his Schools, the Censure will permit “The Book of Art” [a book of dreams to aid in winning in the lottery], and the “Indovina Grillo” [another]. Truly this is a splendid moral education for a people! . . .

‘Rome dreads the passing intercourse of the foreigner. I know, too, that the foreigner sometimes brings corruption, and perhaps does this in Italy; and why? Because Italy is poor and weak. In many cities, and most of all in Rome, multitudes (having no other hope of helping themselves) look, it is true, to the visitor, and, in order to make heavy profits out of him, make themselves servile and abject before him. But let but the Italians be permitted free, open, and honourable means of earning their livelihood, and then see whether they will continue to be the vile slaves of the foreigners’ gold! I hear that very many foreigners visit France, Germany, &c.; but I never hear that they degrade or corrupt those nations.

‘To a people ignorant, feeble, and poverty-stricken, everything is poison. Let them freely use God’s gifts bestowed on them; do not deprive them of their powers (and with them of all sense of their own dignity); permit them to become rich, cultivated, and powerful; and you will have no need to fear foreigners, their corruption, or their influence.’

It may be asked whether there was no reply to this remarkable publication. Yes, there *was* a reply; and it is with real sorrow that we feel it to be a part of our duty to refer to it. The reply was this: *The government of Austria compelled the Grand Duke Leopold to expel Azeoglio from Tuscany.* Now no act could have been more uncongenial to the temper of that prince. Leopold was naturally kind-hearted, generous, conciliatory. He was averse to any unnecessary interference with literary men; as has been shown in these pages, on a former occasion, with reference

---

<sup>1</sup> In Rome, on the Sunday, whilst all shops, cafés, hotels, &c. are shut, and even during the hours of divine service, the lottery offices alone have the privilege of remaining open.

to the Tuscan poet, Giuseppe Giusti. More than once he had ventured to withstand the political dictates of Austria. But there was a limit to his power; he could not always be resisting the swoop of the overshadowing wings and threatening talons of the double-headed eagle. On this occasion, with whatever reluctance, he yielded, and obeyed his master.

But the reply to the pamphlet was still incomplete. There was a lady, the daughter of Manzoni, who (as we remarked), had become, by marriage, the Marchioness Luisa d'Azeglio. A dutiful daughter, as well as an affectionate wife, she was wont at times to repair to Milan to solace the old age of her father. It is almost incredible, but it is nevertheless a simple historical fact, that Francis, Emperor of Austria, *banished this lady from Milan*. This from the lineal descendant of him who was called 'the living law;' the just and chivalrous Rodolph of Hapsburg!

This twofold reply had all the success that it deserved. From that moment the voice of Massimo d'Azeglio resounded through Italy: he acquired a political influence which he never lost. His advice to them—that they should abstain from ill-timed, isolated struggles;<sup>1</sup> that they should cherish civil fortitude, and reserve war for opportunities of national emancipation; that above all they should look to Piedmont—was respectfully listened to, and in most quarters scrupulously followed.

We had earnestly desired to avoid all reference to Austria; because we are averse to any proceeding which may seem to savour of striking the fallen.<sup>2</sup> A preacher in her capital has, to his lasting honour, denounced as sufficient reason for the events of 1866, the immorality of the city of Vienna. The few in England who have studied the recital of the oppression exercised by Austria in Italy, naturally thought more of her rule in those provinces than any domestic guilt, and they said within themselves, as the echo of the guns of Sadowa resounded in their ears, '*Laissez passer la justice de Dieu.*'

A careful reading of the pages which we have just transferred from the pamphlet of Azeglio will supply some more evidence whereon to base a judgment concerning Dr. Newman's assertion:

<sup>1</sup> See Farini i. p. 14, and other authorities. We regard the expulsion of the Marchioness from Milan as the act of the Emperor Francis, because it is well known, as Mr. Grant-Duff observes, that 'he had concentrated in his hands the management, or mismanagement, of the whole of the Home Department and of the Police.' *Studies in European Politics*, p. 142. (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1866.)

<sup>2</sup> This declaration is, on the present writer's part, no *façon de parler*, no mere piece of rhetoric. Some months back he was preparing a pamphlet intended to exhibit the true character of the Austrian rule in Italy, which a distinguished London firm had kindly undertaken to publish. With the news of the cession of Venetia he threw down his pen.

'The Roman people, too, under the sway of the Popes, at least have had a very easy time of it.' But at this point we feel constrained to say a few words respecting the influence of Austria on the Papal government; because, however much we may regret it, it is impossible to do justice to the subject, if we pass by the consideration of that influence. To do so would be not only a wrong to Italy, but it would be a grievous injustice to the Papacy.

For no one can determine how much better in all respects the temporal government of the Papacy *might* have proved, had the Congress of Vienna done, as many even at the time desired, namely, erected a kingdom of Poland and a kingdom of Italy.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Newman, in his volume on 'The Office and Work of Universities,' published in 1856, made some remarks on the relation of Austria to the Roman See; but they were remarks of an off-hand character, little worthy, we must think, of so great a man. To read his flowing sentences, one might think that there had scarcely been any *very* serious complications between Austria and the Papacy since 1815. 'Austria,' says Dr. Newman, 'is a great and religious power; she inherits the prerogatives of the German Empire and the titles of the Cæsars. There must ever be relations of a very peculiar kind between the Holy See and the Holy Roman Empire.' With one part of this assertion we can entirely agree. We think that, during the last half-century, there *have* been 'relations of a *very* peculiar kind' between Rome and Vienna; and we proceed to offer some brief elucidations of our meaning.

Let us imagine a Roman Catholic student at Oscott, being summoned by a prelate of his own communion, strictly examined, with the aid of a legal assessor, respecting the merest trifles of conduct, entirely acquitted, and then addressed by the bishop in the following style:—'*Sir, I regret extremely—these are odious things—but what would you have?—what can one do?—FRANCE COMPELS US TO ACT THUS—the King of the Belgians sends us the notes—you see we cannot act otherwise—THEY ARE STRONGER THAN WE.*' Let us further suppose this student to be a member of an ancient and noble family, whose father was an ambassador at the Court of St. James's (Dr. Northcote might be able to form an opinion respecting the probable influence of this last-named element). Englishmen would think this a *very* peculiar kind of interference. It might even appear in our eyes—but then our notions are *so* narrow and insular—to be something like a grievance. Grievance or not, it is at any rate a *fact*, that a scene

<sup>1</sup> Eustace, in his 'Classical Tour,' made in 1816, prophetically regrets that this was not so arranged by the Congress. Eustace was a Roman Catholic priest, but of the old régime, and very English.

of this nature (substituting 'Austria' for 'France,' and 'Duke of Modena' for 'King of the Belgians') did actually occur at Rome, in 1820, between Monsignore (afterwards Cardinal) Bernetti, and the youthful Massimo d'Azeglio.<sup>1</sup>

Again, during the entire period between 1815 and 1848, this 'great and religious power' not only required (which perhaps was natural) all the parish priests in Lombardy to take the oath of fealty to the Emperor of Austria, not only nominated all the bishops in that province, but further restricted these bishops from all intercourse with Rome, and even from addressing their own flocks without the previous censure of a subaltern employé.<sup>2</sup>

Again, 'the religious power' (it is fair to say in the person of the chief of the police) recommended an illustrious Milanese nobleman to attach himself to the *danseuses* of the opera-house, rather than meddle with politics, on the ground that 'the Emperor loved young men, and wished them to be amused!'<sup>3</sup>

'What is the Pope in reality,' asked Torelli in 1846, 'but a subject of Austria?' (*Che è egli in realtà se non un suddito dell' Austria?*)<sup>4</sup> Lest, however, Italian authorities may seem biased, we will again cite the language of Döllinger:—

'That unhappy, hateful pressure which Austria imposed upon the entire Peninsular, was in reality the main cause why the value of the Papal see, as a moral bulwark to all Italy, became so very much obscured in the eyes of the nation. The Roman Government itself groaned under this pressure, and yet was forced to strengthen and confirm it, by calling in the Austrian troops of occupation, and by the political helplessness that forced it to follow, in temporal and political affairs, the will of the Cabinet of Vienna.'<sup>5</sup>

The following words, from the same author, have an almost prophetic sound; though in general political prophecy is by no means a strong point with Dr. Döllinger:—

'The first possibility is, that a new war breaking out, a victory of the Austrian arms should restore Austrian preponderance and the Papal dominion over the whole extent of the states of the Church. Whether such a turn of affairs is hoped for by many, I do not know; but what I do know is, that it is not wished by any intelligent friend of the Papal see. A permanent occupation of the country by Austrian troops, which would then become necessary, would render the Pope's situation worse, and his temporal power more unattainable.'<sup>6</sup>

Dr. Newman may, however, urge, as he has done in his 'Office of Universities,' that Austria under the rule of its youthful (and really, as we believe, most excellently-intentioned) Emperor,

<sup>1</sup> Authority: M. d'Azeglio himself, in 'La Politique et le Droit Chrétien.'

<sup>2</sup> Authority: The religious and very Roman Cesare Cantù, in his 'Storia di Cento Anni,' vol. iii. p. 486.

<sup>3</sup> Azeglio, *ubi supra*, pp. 78, 79.

<sup>4</sup> Pensieri sull'Italia, quoted by Döllinger.

<sup>5</sup> The Church and the Churches, p. 445.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p. 465.

repealed the Josephine laws. On that point, as regards Lombardy, we must again appeal to Massimo d'Azeglio:—

'Let none say that the Concordat of 1855 has diminished this evil. The Concordat of 1855 was never permitted to be executed in the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom. And this ought to be fully known. . . . The sole privilege which the Lombardo-Venetian clergy seem to have acquired by that Concordat is, that on every appointment to a vacant benefice, the newly-appointed occupant pays to the Austrian Government a fee about equivalent to a whole year's income. . . . Certainly Austria, with the Josephine laws, . . . deserved the severity which armed the conscience of Christendom against her. But when as now [in the Concordat of 1855] she first, by this solemn act, concluded with Pius IX. (which in so many respects resembles the bygone systems that of old raised such implacable hostilities against Catholicism), arms the hands of the Church's enemies, and then herself contrives, by *interpretative instructions*, to make the Concordat a dead letter in so large a portion of the empire, thus leaving to Rome the whole odium of an act whereof she herself eludes the fulfilment, we are led to inquire whether the "service" of the present day be any better than the outrage of the past?'<sup>1</sup>

Politically speaking, Austria, the minor Duchies, the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, and the Papacy were reputed to be friendly. And yet never was friendship more hollow or unsound. In 1848 the Dukes of Parma and Tuscany invited their subjects to join Piedmont in the patriotic attempt to drive the strangers out of Italy;<sup>2</sup> and Cardinal Antonelli loudly declared that there was no safety for the Papacy but in open and declared participation in a crusade against Austria.<sup>3</sup> The 'religious power' was even reported to have announced that in the event of such participation she was prepared to withdraw all bishops in the empire from the *spiritual* authority of Rome; and this rumour, *mirabile dictu*, did not seem in the slightest degree to shock the consciences of the Ultramontane journals like the *Univers*. Naples, too, promised troops against Austria. But when was a Neapolitan Bourbon faithful to his word? These troops never came, and their absence, as much as any one thing, turned the scale against Charles Albert. But just before the fall of that monarchy, Francis II. offered Garibaldi the use of the Neapolitan fleet wherewith to attack Austria, on the condition of the kingdom of Naples being spared.<sup>4</sup> But a reference to the events of 1848,

<sup>1</sup> La Politique et le Droit Chrétien.

<sup>2</sup> Canth, *ubi supra*, and plenty of cognate authorities, French and English, as well as German and Italian.

<sup>3</sup> *Rev. des deux Mondes*, tome xiii. for 1852, p. 55. (M. Gouraud's article.) See the documents as given by Farini, vol. ii. chap. 7.

<sup>4</sup> (*Annuaire des deux Mondes*, for 1859—60). 'The ministers of Francis II. gave a certain La Cecilia 1,200 ducats, and full powers to make the following proposals to Garibaldi for a treaty between him and the King of Naples.

'1st. That Garibaldi should be granted a free passage through Puglia and the Abruzzi, to attack the Marches and Romagna. 2d.

and the still later ones of 1859, may well make us pause for a moment, for a new character had meantime appeared before the eyes of Europe.

The new character was a reforming Pontiff. The Conclave which sat on the occasion of the death of Pope Gregory XVI. in 1846, only lasted for the *very* unusually short space of three days. At the end of that time the electors, many of whom had feared undue influence from Austria, had elected, on June 16th, 1846, the Cardinal Mastai Faretti, since known as Pope Pius the Ninth.

Waving the question, whether it be possible for those who are not members of the Church of Rome to form a fair judgment on the character of a Pope, and especially a Pope yet living, we submit to the judgment of others the following remarks concerning this Pontiff considered as a man, a theologian, and a temporal ruler.

As a man, he enjoys a reputation perhaps as admirable and unstained as ever was accorded to living person by the combined testimony of friend and foe. His antecedents were most excellent. The noble family from which he sprung was greatly respected. As a missionary in Italy in 1816, as secretary to the Legate, Monsignore Muzi, who went to Chili in 1823, as Governor of a Hospital in Rome, as Archbishop of Spoleto, and as Cardinal Bishop of Imola, he had displayed the most exemplary qualities.

Nor has he since belied that reputation. Pure, benevolent, economical, desirous of doing good to others, and personally un-revengeful, he has passed through grievous trials and disappointments with a marvellously unsullied fame, ever creating the impress upon others' minds of the presence of great piety, benignity, and sincerity. Even those least favourable to the system, political and ecclesiastical, which is represented in his

'2d. He should have full leave to levy recruits in the kingdom [of Naples].

'3d. He should be furnished with transports and supplies.

'4th. 50,000 soldiers and the Neapolitan fleet were to be placed at his disposal for the liberation of Venice! (The King of Naples was at this period in close alliance with the Emperor of Austria, and had just received a document from an Imperial Highness at Innspruck to enable him to employ as many of the Austrian soldiers, whose term of service was complete, as he could induce to enlist.)

'5th. Garibaldi was to bind himself not to attack the Neapolitan mainland territory.'

The following note is appended in the *Annuaire*. 'This extraordinary episode cannot be denied; it is related in the greatest detail by M. La Cecilia himself, in a letter dated, "Potenza, Aug. 27," and published in the *Journal Officiel* of Naples, on the 10th of September. Messrs. Martino and Liborio Romano replied to that letter, and denied their personal responsibility: but M. Liborio Romano expressly allowed the correctness of the facts.'



person, are willing, for the most part, to pay the most ample tribute to the extraordinary excellence of the man.

Of Pius IX. as a theologian, we are not able to speak with equal confidence. He does not seem to be credited with the possession of the scientific knowledge of theology or the love of letters possessed by his immediate predecessor. But unless we are much misinformed, he has an intense belief in the spiritual authority of his office. Dr. Newman has recently said, that few Roman Catholics would go so far in the recognition of Papal authority as the present editor of the *Dublin Review*. We suspect that there is at least one man in Italy who goes quite as far; and that is the Pope himself. With such convictions of his own right to decide the most momentous problems in theology, it must be supposed that he regards appeals to antiquity as all but needless, if not positively treasonable; unless they shall be made for the express purpose of supporting a foregone conclusion. Experiments in the direction of freedom of thought have not prospered under the Pontificate of Pius IX. The Congress at Munich met with so little favour, that it has not been repeated; the Congress at Malines fared little better: the *Home and Foreign Review* has been silenced; the theologians of Louvaine have been frowned upon. In Rome itself, the organ of the Jesuits, the *Civiltà* (that particularly uncivil paper, as Passaglia terms it), is the accredited mouthpiece of the court.

Under such a régime it is not wonderful that we hear the repetition of those complaints made by Giacomo Leopardi in 1822,<sup>1</sup> of the utter repression of mental vigour in Rome. This complaint does not come from merely hostile quarters. Persons who have visited the city, with every desire to think favourably of all they saw and heard, employ language hardly less strong than that of Leopardi. With the splendid exception of the astronomer, Father Secchi, science is all but unrepresented in Rome. And just as there is no science, so too there is no literature. Books on archæology and a few local histories are all that can be had.<sup>2</sup> To suppose that, to a highly intellectual population, such repression is no grievance, is simply absurd. Then take the greatest names among philosophic theologians of our time in Italy: Ventura, Rosmini, Gioberti, Passaglia, Tosti; and you do not find *one* that has kept on thoroughly good terms with the court of Rome. And these breaches have occurred, be it observed, under the Pontificate of Pius IX.

But it is as a temporal ruler that we have here to consider Pope Pius. The questions which have been mooted concerning

<sup>1</sup> Epistolario, No. 152. (Firenze: Le Monnier, 1856, vol. i. p. 258.) We have given a great part of this letter in this Review in the article already referred to (p. 326).

<sup>2</sup> Döllinger, pp. 402, 444.

his merits and demerits in this point of view are extremely complex and difficult. It is easy to do him injustice : it is not easy to be fair. By all means let our sentences be read with watchfulness, and even with suspicion. We *desire* that this should be the case.

Dr. Newman speaks of the reigning Pontiff in the following terms :—

‘ He is one whom to see is to love : one who overcomes even strangers, even enemies, by his very look and voice ; whose presence subdues, whose memory haunts even the sturdy, resolute mind of the English Protestant.’  
—*Sermon*, p. 16.

We believe this to be strictly true. The latest manifestation of such a sentiment that has occurred to us came from the lips of a lady, a Scottish Presbyterian, who had been at Rome in 1864. ‘ I do hope,’ said this lady, after employing terms calculated to justify the above-cited language ; ‘ I do hope that they will not take his dominions from him.’ We had no opportunity of reply ; but our thoughts went back some two-and-twenty years—to the day when we had gazed upon Pope Gregory : and we considered that if the *personal* goodness of that Pontiff did not avail to save his states from the condition painted by M. Charles Gouraud ; so, too, it might be small consolation to the friends and parents of prisoners lying in Pontifical dungeons to be assured that Pius IX. is personally kind-hearted, and is utterly ignorant of the cruelty and injustice with which these victims have been treated. The importance of the subject must be our excuse for repetition on this head. We beg the reader to consider once more the following facts, though they have already been stated in another form :—

‘ In strong and dark contrast with what was a characteristic of the Papal Government—with that mildness for which it was justly praised—has been the arbitrary power of imprisonment, filling the gaols with captives, for whom no one, as in other countries, would be permitted to go bail. Cardinal Morichini, in his Finance Report, expatiated upon the wretched state of the prisons, and the unavoidable demoralization of persons confined in them. Even in this matter, financial difficulties rendered it impossible to effect a comprehensive reform. *In the doleful times that have passed since 1848, there grew up a system of incarcerating masses of persons in unhealthy gaols, and from that system sprang up still greater rancour against the authorities.*’

Then, after citing from the Governor of Faenza the instances, already named, of persons dragged to prison on precaution, and adding that Governor’s own remarks, that ‘ 450 such cases have been pending for four or five years,’ and that ‘ by such modes ‘ of proceeding no love for princes can be implanted in the hearts ‘ of the people,’ Dr. Döllinger adds :—

‘ It is to be understood that such circumstances as these occurred without the slightest knowledge on the part of the Pope. *Had he been*

made acquainted with them, his own goodness of heart and love of justice would, most assuredly, have impelled him to oppose and put an end to them.<sup>1</sup>

This last sentence suggests to our minds three questions. *Firstly*, What sort of *entourage* has Pius IX. around him, that he cannot hear of these things? *Secondly*, Are the subjects of a government bound to be content with a cruel *régime* because the head of the state has not the slightest knowledge of what is being done? *Thirdly*, are 'the doleful times since 1848' contemporaneous with a part of Dr. Newman's 'very easy time'?

But it is necessary to go back in thought to the beginning of this Pontiff's reign, and to mark the beams of a dawn which seems to be ending in such storm and gloom. And here we think that any honest man will feel himself compelled to make very large admissions respecting the difficulties which beset the first steps of *Pio Nono*. If his immediate predecessors, the two Piuses, Leo, and, above all, Gregory, had *desired* to render the Papal throne untenable in the future, it is difficult to see how any men (not being by nature wicked and tyrannical) could have contrived to make matters much worse than they had become by the year 1846. In that year, Pius IX. entered upon an inheritance mortgaged, almost beyond precedent, not merely in respect of silver and gold, but of the more precious articles of a people's trust and love. The glad shout that hailed the return of Pius VII. in 1814 had long since died away, and in its stead was cherished a deep and rankling sense of disappointment; a sentiment possibly in some respects exaggerated and unreasonable, but, in the main, only too well founded.

The mere advent of a new ruler created a gleam of hope. Unknown as he was to the general public of Rome, Count Mastai Ferretti had on his side not only the advantage of his noble personal presence, but the fact that he was still in the prime of life. It was not long before he fanned into a fresh blaze the dying embers of the fire of loyalty.

An English politician has cast an air of lasting ridicule over the very phrase of the 'three courses.' We fear, however, that it is impossible to dispense with a phrase, which so often represents a solid fact. *Pio Nono* found the prisons in his dominions entirely full of political offenders; and he certainly had three courses open to his choice. Course *one* was simply to leave them there. Course *two*, to appoint a commission, which should select proper objects of mercy and set them free; at the same time reducing punishments in the case of all but the utterly hardened and incorrigible, who had combined real crime with political struggles. Course *three* was to proclaim a general amnesty. The first of these plans would have created an absolute despair, which in no

<sup>1</sup> Dollinger, *ubi supra*, p. 397.

short time must have been followed by the wildest outbursts of revolutionary excess. It may be doubted whether there was even a single cardinal of sane mind who would have taken on himself the responsibility of advising that matters should be left *in statu quo*. The *second* course would have been very feasible in any country which had been governed according to law. In England, France, or Prussia, the notes of judges and records of trials could have been appealed to, and a commission might speedily have advised that A, B, and C should be pardoned; D set free, but banished for two years; E detained a little longer, with hopes held out to him; and F retained for the present, as being to all appearance hopelessly incorrigible. Some 1800 years ago, Claudius Lysias rescued a prisoner from the hands of the Jews, and bade his accusers state distinctly before Felix and before Festus what their charges really were. Festus too proclaimed, that it was not 'the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accused have the accusers face to face, and have licence to answer for himself concerning the charges brought against him.'<sup>1</sup> But the *Christian* rulers of Rome and the *Romagna* had lost sight of these most excellent and righteous *heathen* rules. The cardinals had *not* thought it 'unreasonable to send a prisoner and not withal to specify the charges laid against him.' And how could they, with the slightest prospect of fairness, grant a partial amnesty? In the long list of those condemned (to take a single instance) by Cardinal Rivarola, who—save the Judge of all men—had the glimmer of an idea respecting the amount of guilt contracted by men whose sentences had been '*pronounced privately, at the simple will of the Cardinal, upon mere presumption that the parties belonged to the liberal sects;—and without any opportunity given to the accused for defence?*'<sup>2</sup>

Thus, this intermediate course, which in itself surely looks fair and wise, though possible elsewhere, was impossible in Rome. But we can well believe those writers who declare that a comprehensive amnesty was the step most grateful to the generous heart of the new Pontiff; nor do we think it in the least degree improbable that many of the prisoners then liberated may have since displayed signal ingratitude. Still the amnesty was a grand and noble act, nor can we perceive that subsequent results have ever proved that any other course would have proved more beneficial either to the people or to the Papal Government. Let those who censure it point out the plan of action which they would, under the circumstances, have recommended.

<sup>1</sup> Acts xxiii. 26—35; xxiv. 7 *et seq.*; xxv. 16, 27. The word 'crime,' in our present usage, answers less well to *ἔγκλημα* and *αἷμα* than does 'charge.'

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Gladstone, as quoted above, p. 155.

The Pope was supposed, at this period, to have set much store on the advice of Father Ventura. The general drift of his actions marched towards a reconciliation with the spirit of temporal progress. His private charities were on a scale of the most princely munificence. He paid the debts of the prisoners incarcerated as debtors in the Capitol, gave away in dowries to poor maidens a sum equivalent to nearly 2,800*l.*; conceded far more liberty to the Jews than they had previously enjoyed; reduced the expenses of his own table and household; and suppressed pensions which had been unjustly bestowed. The deservedly popular Cardinal Gizi, whom many had desired to see Pope, was created Secretary of State, and under his able administration the material wants of the country received prompt and vigorous attention. Such attention was indeed deeply needed. Meanwhile the Pope did not forget the other side of his functions; and a letter addressed by him on June 14, 1847, to the heads of the religious orders, has been greatly praised.<sup>1</sup>

But the inherent difficulties of the position which he occupied now began to make themselves felt. In 1831 a famous memorandum had been presented to the reigning Pontiff, Gregory XVI. by the great Powers of Europe (including Prussia, Russia, and England), recommending many improvements. But in 1847, the spectacle of a reforming Pope was far from agreeable to many of the *employés* who had served under Gregory and his Secretary Cardinal Lambruschini; far from agreeable to at least one of the great European Powers.

That Power, we need hardly say, was Austria. The feeling of the court of Vienna may be judged of by a brief extract from a letter afterwards (in July, 1849) presented to the British Parliament. In this letter our Ambassador, Lord Ponsonby, announces the *more* than readiness of Austria to assist the Papal Government, which it considered to be very weak. 'His Highness' [Prince Metternich], says Lord Ponsonby, 'used the following words *twice or thrice*: "The Emperor has determined 'not to lose his Italian possessions.'" <sup>2</sup> Precisely so. It was in that quarter the one dominant sentiment.

A plot was formed in Rome to isolate the Pope from his new advisers. It was the work of the Sanfedisti. Its dimensions have probably been much exaggerated; and the complicity of Austria, which is still thoroughly believed in by many, must in our judgment be pronounced *not proven*.<sup>3</sup> The plot, such as it

<sup>1</sup> For the assertions made in this paragraph, see the *Nouv. Biog. Gén. art. Pie IX.*; and compare Farini, Döllinger, and the newspapers of that date.

<sup>2</sup> Letter given by Farini, vol. i. p. 230, and Mr. Gladstone's note.

<sup>3</sup> The *Nouv. Biog. Gén.* believes in this complicity. But French writers are possibly a little prejudiced against Austria. Farini's very temperate comments tend the other way.

was, came to nothing, but the provincial towns had meanwhile resolved to keep with rejoicings the anniversary of the amnesty. These rejoicings seem to have been in some places slightly noisy and tumultuous; and on the 17th July, 1847, the Austrians, on this shallow pretext, took the insulting step of marching into and taking possession of the town of Ferrara. The Cardinal Legate of Ferrara, Ciacchi, published protests of great force and dignity against this act of usurpation.

And now drew on that crisis which so forcibly displayed to the mind of Italy and of all Europe the serious difficulties which inevitably surround the throne of a Pontiff-King. Whatsoever in Italy was tender in devotion, whatsoever was lofty in genius, whatsoever was noble with the nobleness of long descent, with the loftier nobleness of inborn spirit, or with both combined; whatsoever was fanned with the love of freedom and the breath of hope,—all from Alps to sea had long been chanting, sometimes lowly sometimes loudly, the one chorus: 'Away with the stranger: ' *fuori il straniero.*'

For this end had poets sung, and statesmen planned, and mothers counted as little the lives of their children, and patriots resigned the amusements of social intercourse and the prospects of peaceful life, and been consigned to the dungeons of Spielberg. Men who differed in much else at least were agreed in this. They might be in politics federatists, monarchists, or republicans; in religion ultramontane or sceptical; but they were bent on seeing as its own mistress, untrod by the step of a foreign soldiery,

'Il bel paese,  
Dov' il sì suona, e il mare circonda e l'Alpi.'<sup>1</sup>

Those who disbelieve us may be asked to name one single writer of genius who took the other side. At present, passing by the long list of poets or secular writers, we will only mention three who are in spiritual matters specially pro-papal; namely, Cesare Cantù, Cesare Balbo, and the Benedictine monk Luigi Tosti. For Cantù let his '*Storia di Cento Anni*' speak.<sup>2</sup> For Balbo it is enough to observe that he boasts that no less than *eleven* of his name and family fought sword in hand against Radetzky at the disastrous conflict of Novara. The burning words of Tosti were cited in March, 1866, from the University pulpit at Oxford; and if nothing else in the preacher's discourse fixed the attention of his audience, these words at least certainly did.

The seizure of Ferrara and the protest of Ciacchi produced a prodigious effect upon the public mind. And now what was to follow on the part of a sovereign who also claimed to be an *Episcopus Episcoporum*? No candid mind will venture to assert

<sup>1</sup> A passage bearing on this subject will be found in our number for April 1862, p. 341.

<sup>2</sup> Messina 1864.



that the answer to this question is a simple or an easy one. That, in his heart of hearts, *Pio Nono* loved his native land; that he would have been most thankful to see every Austrian soldier withdrawn across the Alps, there can be little doubt. He even advised the Emperor of Austria not to insist on a rule which was against the will and conscience of the governed. Austria, of course, paid as much attention as she usually has done to good advice from her truest friends. Meanwhile there broke out at Paris, on February 10, 1848, the revolution which drove King Louis Philippe from his throne.

Troops went forth from Rome with the Pope's blessing, which *virtually*, though not professedly, aided the anti-Austrian cause, if only in this way: that they set other Italian regiments at liberty to act against Radetzky. But the Pope rejected Antonelli's advice, and refused to declare war against Austria. History will probably honour him for this refusal; and for our own part we most certainly are not prepared to blame him. But the refusal caused an outbreak, which ended in the shameful assassination of Rossi, and the flight of the Pontiff to Gaeta, on the 24th of November, 1848.

We cannot but think that those have reason on their side who maintain that, if flight was a necessity, Civit  Vecchia, being in his own dominions, would have proved a far better place. He would have been equally safe, and far less under foreign influence. As matters stood, Pius IX. was surrounded at Gaeta with a retrograde set of Neapolitans and of foreign ambassadors. *From that date, the reforming Pope became a reactionary Pope.* The man who had tried to make terms with modern civilization became the decided opponent of that spirit which at first he had fostered and helped to spread abroad.

We have wished to proclaim ungrudgingly the convictions of the goodness of the *man*. With the *theologian* we are, of course, unable to sympathise; nor do we at all imagine that his school of divinity will triumph even within the pale of his own communion. But as regards the sovereign our impression is—of course, we *may* be prejudiced and mistaken—that Pius IX. does *not* possess the gifts which constitute the statesman. After trying to make all allowance for the *damnosa h reditas* to which he succeeded, and for the extraordinary difficulties of his position, we are unable to discern in his conduct any *single faint* trace of those large and comprehensive views, which are naturally associated in our minds with such memories as those of a Hildebrand and an Innocent III. But we have been bestowing on our readers far too much of our own. It is high time to return to the evidence of others.

One result of the Pope's acceptance of the hospitality of Gaeta

is thought to have been this: that he could never again open his lips respecting any wrong-doings committed in the kingdom of the Two Sicilies. Whatever might be the breaches of good faith towards the people on the part of their rulers, whatever the severity of political punishments, whatever the ecclesiastical abuses, there was one quarter from which King Ferdinand and his son, Francis II., were safe. No syllable of remonstrance was likely to come, *none ever did come*, from the lips of the chief Bishop of Italy. At this point we shall introduce a few passages concerning Sicily from a little publication which ought to have been included in our list, the '*Elemosina e Ricchezza*'<sup>1</sup> of Father Filippo Bartolommeo. This writer was for some time one of the delegates for the promotion of education among the lower classes in Sicily. His theology is intensely Roman; indeed, we shall presently refer to one of his tracts which is specially directed against Protestantism.

'This Christian and excellent institution [he is alluding to infant schools] which has long been widely spread among all civilized nations, was till 1860 only hoped for, by all the educated classes in the ex-kingdom of the Two Sicilies. The immorality or the foolish policy of the extinct Government had always prevented this hope from being realized. The Jesuits also, under various pretexts, co-operated with the various Governments of Italy (then so dismembered), and consisting in reality only of Austrian provinces. The Jesuits co-operated with all these Governments in opposing insurmountable obstacles to the unity and independence of Italy, to the inevitable and successive development of the faculties of the human mind, to all progress, to human perfectibility, to the universal and true opinion that it is God's will that this shall be realized, and they blamed, condemned, and resisted, by their preachings, by their books, by their intrigues, and by their manœuvres, infant schools and asylums, mendicity refuges, institutions of public benevolence, prison systems, savings banks, popular education, steamboats, and railroads. . . .

'Popular education (let us honestly confess it) *existed not*, either in the convictions, the desires, the habits, or the practice of the greater part of the Neapolitan, Sicilian, or *Roman* provinces. These fallen Governments (who, on the contrary, dreaded it as the greatest enemy to their despotism) had always opposed it, after the fashion of barbarian sovereigns, by the wretched pay they allowed the masters, by the bad systems and ignorant teachers they provided, and by the worthless books they put into the hands of the children. . . .

'It is a fact long since equally well known to all people, that formerly in Sicily, in the ex-kingdom of Naples, in the ex-Pontifical states (wherein the wealth of the many episcopal sees, and of the numerous monasteries, passed all bounds), there is not a single infant school, not a day or Sunday school, not an orphanage, whether for boys or girls, not a mendicants' refuge, not an asylum for poor girls in danger of temptation from their poverty, or for the fallen who repent; not a reformatory for boys, after or before they have incurred punishment—in a word, not one single institution for the prevention or cure, the lessening or correcting, of any species of vice or misfortune, which is supported either wholly, or half, or even

<sup>1</sup> Messina, 1864.

only a third, or a quarter, by any of the rich episcopal prebends, or by the vast possessions of the Cloistered Societies. . . .

'Within a space of thirty years, the diocese of Messina was governed by four successive archbishops, whom the Bourbons rewarded with that dignity (and with its prebendal income of 7,000 ounces annually, beside the heavy fees from new canons, new curés, new archpriests, and new abbesses of thirteen monasteries, and all the ordinary *Cancellaria* [Diocesan] fees) . . . for the supreme merit of having been born sons of princely, ducal, or other titled houses. Neither I, nor any of my excellent brethren the clergy of Messina, nor the people of that metropolis, or of the diocese, ever heard the voice of our most noble pastors utter one single sermon or homily, or pronounce one syllable of religious instruction. Two of them could not even understand the text of the Bible, nor did they possess as much as a copy of it, or even a translation. . . . Innumerable, and of every order and of every colour, are the cloistered proprietors of both sexes. The lands of the feminine monastics form a very large proportion of the ecclesiastical property in Sicily. All these live in ease and comfort; many who belong to the wealthiest monasteries lead a life of luxury. . . . In none of their churches and basilicas, though placed in the most populous parts of the country, is there ever heard (on the Sunday even) the voice of a monk giving a brief sermon, or a simple explanation of religious doctrine. . . . The clerical and priestly portion of them pass their time singing in choir; the lay members in collecting those alms which, according to Jesus Christ, would be much better bestowed on the orphan, the widow, and the sick—on all who are unable to labour. . . .

'It is by no means my desire to declare war to monachism and the religious societies, or to proclaim them useless or hurtful to the civil community, in the same way or on the same grounds on which this is done by the profound philosopher or the learned economist. I look at these institutions solely in their religious aspect, and I have endeavoured to prove that the episcopate, as well as the cloister, should not regard themselves as proprietors, but as administrators, of the goods of the poor, and that in Sicily they have not fulfilled their duty of aiding, instructing, and civilizing the unhappy classes among our people. I know also that the type, the ideal of a monk, of a friar, as exemplified in those holy founders, is not to be found in our day among the many individuals composing the so great variety of our cloistered orders, and that the monasteries and the convents are not (as they were in their beginnings) the resort of learned excellent persons of mortified life.'

We commend these remarks to those who marvel at the existence of anti-monastic feeling in Italy and Sicily

The following is from his preamble to the '*Discorso contra il Protestantismo*.' It is specially addressed to the clergy of Messina and of other Italian provinces. It corroborates what we have just affirmed; namely, the change which passed over the spirit of Pope Pius after the flight to Gaeta. That he should have been disappointed was natural; but this sudden and complete revulsion of opinion, this determination to break with all the ideas which he had cherished, and to ban all that he had heretofore blessed, is precisely one of those changes which is often seen in the career of an impulsive, feverish, and irresolute mind, and precisely what is *not* seen in the history and development of a really kingly and commanding one. For this is no

case of a man being led onwards by a supposed logical necessity to conclusions which he did not originally perceive ; on the contrary, it is the intellectual, unheroic process of tying up premisses and conclusions into one bundle of fagots for the burning :—

‘ Pius IX. was, as every one knows, the initiator of the Italian revolution of 1849, the object of which was the liberty and independence of the nation ; but afterwards, yielding to the suggestions of the Roman Court, he contradicted himself, and became, by his authority, by his actions, and by secret intrigues, its most determined opponent. . . . If the reformed sects shall take root in this [Messina] and in other of the great cities of Italy, and from them gradually extend to the lesser towns, the responsibility of that great evil will lie wholly on the clerical party, which so obstinately opposes itself to the most legitimate desires, to the progress in civilization, and to the *autonomy* of the country. If it will persist in its stolid opposition, if it will continue unscrupulously to confound the rights of God with those of Cæsar, and maintain the union, in the person of the Pontiff, of the priesthood and the empire, this strange new doctrine and its anomalous teaching will sooner or later (I foresee with sorrow) be followed by the Italian nation for mere peace and quietness’ sake.

‘ The establishment of a great national Church, ruled, as in Russia, Prussia, Sweden, Denmark, and Greece, by the sovereign, will be inevitable. The chief obstacle hitherto to the effecting of this [*attuazione*] has been the long-suffering of Victor Emmanuel, the deep catholicity of the House of Savoy. . . .

‘ It is superfluous for me to explain that I am now considering the Papacy in the purity of its Divine institution, and not as in great degree turned from the fulfilment of its religious duties by the burden and pomp of its worldly kingdom, which was wholly man’s work, and so, like all other human institutions, has a beginning, a development, a decline, and an end. Emperors and kings lavished honours and rich fiefs on the episcopate, and placed above the immortal tiara of the great priest and first of bishops the fading earthly crown, in order to lessen and control the freedom and independence of the Church, subdue by favours the dreaded moral power of the Pope, make him an accomplice in their policy, and their own equal in despotism.

‘ For eight hundred years the Church, strong in her moral strength only, and in her invincible power of preaching the Gospel, triumphed over all the persecutions raised against her by the powers of hell, advanced and spread over the whole world, and reached the summit of her greatness and prosperity. . . . During that long period of eight hundred years, the clergy never once conceived the idea of a temporal dominion, nor, amidst all the subtle intellects Catholicism boasted, was there found one who stolidly (not to say heretically) taught that the liberty and independence of the Church could have no guarantee but in a sceptre and royal crown for her head. . . .

‘ That saintly Gregory (whom schism itself, and heresy and unbelief, reverence) never surrounded himself with soldiers and armed men, with *sbirri*, jailors, executioners, and brigands ; he never thundered anathemas against a noble people, struggling to regain their just rights, trampled on by a cruel tyranny ; he never invoked the secular power to reduce that people to slavery by intrigues and deceptions ; he never sat amid a tribe of astute and greedy courtiers and diplomatists, the ceaseless watchers of the thoughts, and dictators of the actions, of a Pope-king ; but his delight was to divide his bread with the poor, to soothe the sorrows of the wretched, and, as a loving father, to address salutary admonishing to

peoples and kings ; and these last bent their heads and hearts reverently before the holiness and wisdom of the humble successor of the Apostles. Compare those eight centuries of the Pope's spiritual rule with those which followed, when religious power and worldly were confounded in one and the same person, and against all right and justice each one was alternately used to support the other ; you will behold Italy a prey to dissension, blood-stained, spoiled, oppressed, by foreign arms ; the little Pontifical state semi-barbarous, superstitious, crushed beneath the rule of a clerical caste with no instruction, who, from their celibate state, and also from their being frequently foreigners, were alike devoid of family ties and of any regard for the country.

The silence of Pope Pius respecting any wrong doings in Sicily is adduced by M. Forcade as one of two instances in which the possession of temporal power does not appear to have furthered spiritual independence, but rather to have weakened it. The other case is that of Gregory XVI. That Pontiff (who afterwards, to his undying honour, so grandly rebuked the Emperor Nicholas) sought the aid of Austria to put down an insurrection in the Marches and in Romagna. But Austria, in order to effect this, was obliged to come to terms with Russia ; and Russia was at that moment (1831) actively engaged against Poland. Pope Gregory consequently resigned all idea of favouring Poland, and some millions of Uniates were lost to the Roman Church. It is to be observed that Polish writers, though ardently Roman, seldom display much interest in the temporalities. They have had another disappointment lately from the reigning Pontiff. Unwilling, it would seem, to break with Alexander II., who is understood to be a defender of the temporalities, Pius IX. is believed to have clipped his sentences, and to have complained only of the wrong done to the Roman Catholic *clergy* in Poland.

On the occasion of the return from Gaeta, the vengeance of the Papal Government was displayed in a most unworthy manner, and had to be checked by the French authorities. It may be said that the Pope did not know of these things. That is very possible. There is scarcely any degree of ignorance of what goes on around him, of which we cannot conceive him to be capable. But when youths who (wrongly and foolishly enough) have celebrated with fireworks the anniversary of the Republic are condemned to *twenty years of the galleys*, and when the disuse of tobacco is also punished by the galleys,<sup>1</sup> on the ground that the abstainers had conspired to renounce the practice of smoking, in order to diminish the revenue and annoy the Government, that Government must, as a whole, take the responsibility of its own acts, and be content that its chief should suffer for the faults

---

<sup>1</sup> Farini : Letter to Mr. Gladstone at the end of vol. iv. of the History. The French authorities, as will be seen, *entirely* confirm Farini's statements.

of those beneath him. Pius IX. chose to exclude from power, and from all weight in the counsels of the Court, the wisest and most temperate among the cardinals, namely, Amat, Bofondo, Ciacchi, Marini, Orioli, and Soglia.<sup>1</sup> He could not plead the excuse, which is often justly urged on behalf of a constitutional sovereign, that certain counsellors were forced upon him. In homely but expressive phrase, in this matter at least, he made his own bed and he must lie upon it.

We have passed by the subject of the Roman republic and the rule of Mazzini.<sup>2</sup> In like manner, as only indirectly bearing upon the subject here being discussed, we shall say nothing of the theological questions (in themselves deeply interesting and important) which were treated during the Pope's exile. It is however curious to observe, that on at least two separate occasions after his return in 1850, a *theological* manifesto was made public, because certain *political* events had taken place. The latest case was that of the Encyclical, which was brought out when the convention between France and Italy was made known.

We have not space to say more of the period between 1850-1856, than that its character, as has been observed, was intensely reactionary. The public lottery, condemned by former Pontiffs as an irreligious mode of raising revenue, remained (and still remains) in force. The censure of the press became more arbitrary than ever; that censure which in years gone by had permitted the publication of the virtually atheistic dialogues of Leopardi, and which in our days has been rigorously exercised against the Christian but anti-governmental writings of Reali and Passaglia.

We shall now submit to the reader several pages from the *Annuaire des deux Mondes* of the years 1856-1858. If we have anywhere omitted to specify the pages, the reader who may desire to verify our citations will easily find them in the *Annuaire* for the year herein specified, under the head of *L'Italie* or *Les États Romains*.

#### 1856.—Brigandage.

'The country round Rome is so far from having ceased (as was affirmed) to be the classic land of brigandage, that, quite lately, the Countess Tattini, cousin to the Emperor Napoleon III., was attacked, and held in captivity for four hours, with her husband and children, by a troop of brigands, in her Castle of Quaderna, which was given up to pillage. M. Rayneval himself (French Ambassador at Rome) had an audacious robbery committed in his own palace.'—1856-7, p. 260, *note*.

<sup>1</sup> Farini, vol. iv. p. 316.

<sup>2</sup> Our sentiments on this subject have, however, been given at some length in our number for April, 1862, pp. 269-271 (text and notes). We mention this, lest we should appear to be dishonestly evading any portion of the subject.



1857.—Non-fulfilment of the seven ameliorations promised in 1849 by a *motu proprio* of the Pope, although the governors of the provinces unanimously pronounced their fulfilment might now be ventured on with perfect safety.

‘It is none the less averred that, in his wisdom, the holy Pontiff invariably repelled all the combinations which were offered to his acceptance to favour the execution of the reforms. He alleged foreign occupation, the state of siege, the abnormal situation of the country, in proof of the impossibility of proceeding in a regular manner. It was vain to show him that material order being ensured, by the presence of both French and Austrian troops, no danger could possibly arise from the application of the law. . . . The sovereign’s will had to be obeyed, and the electoral right conceded to Roman citizens in 1849 adjourned till 1860 at the soonest.’—*Ibid.* p. 261.

‘On terminating its session the Consulta remitted to the Government a memorial pointing out the reforms considered desirable by its members. None of these “memorials” even obtained any reply. The Pope, it is true, named a Commission of Cardinals to examine them; but the two commissioners who were least opposed to any reforms, Cardinals Marini and Morrichini, gave in their resignation, and the Commission is now reduced to Cardinal Antonelli, Secretary of State, Gavelli, President of the Consulta, and Gazeri, who is eighty-five years old. . . . It is to be regretted that, on his restoration, Pius IX. permitted the formation of a Council of Censure, to inquire into the conduct of the *employés* during the revolution. Many hundreds of those unhappy subalterns were deprived of their situations for having taken an oath to the Republic, which they could not have refused without bringing their families into misery. . . . Other harsh measures also appear, very little conformable to the amnesty. By an edict of July 30, 1855, the punishment of the *wooden horse* was introduced again. On the 20th of May, 1851, the Tribunal of the *Sacra Consulta*, presided over by Monsignore Antonio Sibilia, condemned a silk mercer, named Pietro Encoli, aged thirty-four, for the crime of having prevented a comrade’s smoking, from a spirit of political opposition, to twenty years of irons! which he is still undergoing. Other condemnations to irons, or flogging, had quite as slight causes.’—*Ibid.* pp. 263, 264.

1857.—The famous journey of the Pontiff through his states, described in some quarters as *un véritable triomphe*.

‘On the 4th of May, 1857, the Sovereign Pontiff left Rome to make a journey of some length through his dominions. He successively visited Assisi, Perugia, and Macerata, on his way to Bologna, where his arrival was the more impatiently looked for, as the population hoped to obtain from his presence some alleviation of the sufferings of the country. Crowds flocked to meet him on his passage, as they do to see all princes; but the enthusiasm which should have been excited in Catholic subjects by the appearance of the Father of Christianity was checked by political discontent. It was evident to what a degree the temporal prince injured the Pope in the heart of the Roman States, when Pius IX. visited such towns as Florence and Modena, where he was merely the father of the faithful. At Perugia were mingled with acclamations of the sovereign, cries of “Bread and the Statute!” At Bologna (where he arrived on the 9th of June), it is undeniable that, in spite of the intimidation exercised by Austrian bayonets, hisses were twice heard. Besides incessant acts of brigandage (which had not been stopped even by the execution of the brigand chief Lazzarini a few days before), the Bolognese had scarcely recovered the excitement aroused amongst them by a serious dissension

between Cardinal Viale, Archbishop of Bologna, and Monsignor Amici, the civil governor of the city. The cardinal, having directed the holding of a mission of fifteen days, had ordered all the theatres to be closed for that period, and nothing less than the firm and persistent opposition of Monsignor Amici had availed to induce him to renounce that project.'—*Ibid*, 1857-8, p. 258.

'Even the official reception that the Pope received, although everywhere respectful and proper, was not of the enthusiastic and brilliant character that he had a right to expect. It is maintained that the high clergy had sent a word of command (*mot d'ordre*) from Rome, and that (well recollecting the events of 1844) they had insisted that all those who depended on them should abstain from too warm demonstrations, lest they should inveigle the Pontiff into fresh concessions. On the other hand, Cardinal Antonelli, dreading from the lay population demonstrations in a very opposite direction, had forbidden any meetings of the Municipal Councils in the towns the Pope was to pass through, and officially desired that no excessive expenditure should be incurred in receiving him. He found it useless, after that, to send a secret circular, recommending the *Gonfalonieri* to omit nothing which might render the reception of the sovereign splendid in every respect. The *Gonfalonieri*, thus placed between contradictory directions, the more willingly adhered to the first ones, inasmuch as, not being allowed to convene the Councils of which they were presidents, they saw that they would be compelled themselves alone to fix the amount to be expended, a proceeding not very legal, and very compromising to their responsibility.'—*Ibid*, p. 259.

'In the end, the Cardinal Secretary of State, despite all these precautions, failed in his efforts to prevent all political manifestations. Unable to use their Municipal Councils as their organs, the principal inhabitants of the chief towns met spontaneously and expressed their desires in addresses, which they consigned to the *Gonfalonieri*, with a request that they would present them to the Sovereign Pontiff. Bologna, the second city in the State, boldly took the initiative. In the most becoming and moderate language, the address declared that had the Municipal Council been convened, it would have charged its president to express to the Holy Father its homage, and, at the same time, its sorrow at the evils under which the country was suffering, and its prayer for their amendment. . . . At the foot of this address were the greatest names in the country, and amongst them that of Count Zucchini, Councillor of State.

'The principal places, such as Cesena, Forlì, Ferrara, Faenza, Ravenna, and others beside, followed the example of Bologna. The Ravenna address deserves especial mention for its clearness and precision. Covered by forty signatures of the principal inhabitants (amongst whom were fifteen municipal councillors who had been appointed by Government), it pointed out the permanent opposition between the tendencies of the Government, and the just and liberal aspirations of the people. . . .

'And, as if this unanimous manifestation as to the political tendencies of the Pontifical Government were not enough, each body in the state held it as a point of honour to present to Pío IX. its own special complaints. Thus at Bologna, the advocates and the Council of the Faculty of Advocates, . . . and the Chamber of Commerce, . . . even the students, to the number of 250.

'But it was not enough to draw up addresses; it was necessary to get them placed before the eyes of the Pontiff, and there was the difficulty. They had reckoned on the *Gonfalonieri*, but if the signers were comparatively safe, from mere numbers, it might be compromising for the first magistrate in each town to put himself forward alone. . . . They tried to

ascertain whether the Pope would receive these addresses, and on learning that Pio IX. would not have them officially presented to him, because he wished to preserve his initiative in the good that was to be done, and not seem to act on compulsion, they contrived to have them in a *non-formal* manner (*officieusement*) laid before him. So a circular from Cardinal Antonelli, forbidding the *Gonfalonieri* to receive in future any address, came too late. To confess the truth, the newspapers which defend the Pontifical policy took advantage of the *via media* that had been adopted to assert that no addresses had been presented!! It was found necessary, in order to silence them, for the principal subscribers of the addresses to have them published in the liberal papers of Piedmont: even then the most furious defenders of the Holy See persisted in denying the authenticity of the documents so published. Then the names of those who had signed one or two of the petitions were published: the effect produced by that divulging of the greatest names among the citizens at last caused all discussion to cease: it was wished, at all events, to avoid the additional sensation and scandal that would have been produced, by the publication of the names appended to all the remaining addresses. . . . An energetic letter from Signor Giovacchino Pepoli, grandson by his mother of King Murat, and an inhabitant of Bologna, bitterly reproached the senator (mayor) Davia, for not having *officially* presented the address in favour of reform to the Sovereign Pontiff. Still later (September 30), when at last, on the Pope's re-entering Rome, the Municipal Council of Bologna was again permitted to assemble, the *Signori* Marsili, Bevilacqua, Malvezzi, and others, complained to the Senator that he had not convened the Council for a discussion as to the expenditure to be caused by the Pontiff's stay. Signor Davia was forced, in self-defence, to produce the circular from Cardinal Antonelli, formally prohibiting their meeting.

'On the Pope's re-entry into Rome, Cardinal Antonelli, by a proclamation, invited the Romans to manifest their joy. On his side, Pius IX. insisted that the 7,000 *scudi*, voted for public rejoicings, should be distributed to the poor. Also he brought a piece of good news, namely, that the Austrian occupation, which till then had cost the Roman states two millions of francs (80,000*l.*) annually, would be henceforth defrayed by Austria. But the Roman people were very questionably satisfied at this concession. They had expected the entire evacuation of the two towns. . . . The real sentiments of the Romans were not long in showing themselves. That ardent population was not willing to let other cities have alone the honour of raising their voice in favour of liberal institutions. An address was speedily drawn up, and covered with numerous signatures. From prudence, and in a spirit of moderation, the subscribers asked for no political reforms, but merely for civil ameliorations, amongst these a code which should abolish exceptional tribunals.

'The Pontifical police got wind of this petition while it was being circulated for signature. It used intimidations, made domiciliary searches and arrests. Several persons, amongst whom was the brother of the police assessor, Dandini, were handed over to justice on the accusation of having signed the petition. And, if the arrests were not more numerous, it is due to the municipal secretary, Vannutelli, who, in the absence of the senator, and under threat of dismissal if he did not reveal the names of the subscribers, refused to know anything of them or to receive them, so long as he had not a formal order from the municipal magistrates. The signatures were therefore deposited with M. Migliorati, Sardinian *chargé d'affaires*, and thus saved from the police; a most necessary measure, at a moment when the police were arresting all known subscribers, and even those who were only suspected. . . .

'A short time after, the Pope held a Sacred Consistory (September 25). He then pronounced an allocution in Latin, 'spoke of his journey, and seemed extremely pleased with it. He avoided all mention of the economic or political condition of the provinces he had visited, and only alluded to the petitions he had received to observe that they only concerned the special and local needs and trade. In so speaking, he only meant such petitions as had been *officially* laid before him; as for political and administrative petitions, which (as we have shown) had been non-formally (*officieuxment*)<sup>1</sup> placed in his hands, he judged it best to pass them over in silence.'—*Ibid.* p. 264 (tome viii).

In 1859 broke out the war between France and Austria. Into the causes and into the progress of that war we have no need to enter. The mere mention of the battles of Magenta and Solferino, and of the peace of Villafranca, will sufficiently remind our readers of certain leading incidents in that short but decisive campaign. What it is to our purpose to observe is, that the war compelled Austria to withdraw her garrisons from the Romagna, and that thereupon, *immediately, one hundred and twenty-one deputies, of whom one-half were nobles, voted UNANIMOUSLY for annexation to Piedmont.*<sup>2</sup>

Now the defenders point (we grant, not unnaturally, for men who are very hard-pressed to find even the shadow of an argument) to the difficulties of the British government in Ireland. To deny the seriousness of those difficulties, to pretend that there have been, or that there are at present, no wrongs and grievances, would be absolutely childish, and only worthy of a member of the *most* reactionary clique of cardinals. But at present we must dismiss the allusion to Ireland with the remark, that when the one hundred and five deputies (or Members of Parliament, as we call them) who represent Ireland, vote unanimously for severance from Great Britain, it will then be high time for the British nation to consider with seriousness the propriety of such separation. Meanwhile, we can only express a hope that no Irish secretary will treat Cork or Wexford as Cardinal Antonelli treated Bologna and Ravenna; and that no Lord-Lieutenant will enjoy such 'a Cadmean victory' as the *véritable triomphe* gained by the journey of the Sovereign Pontiff in the year 1857.

The Papal court has, as a rule, adopted the plan of recognizing *de facto* governments. When the Spanish colonies revolted from Spain, they were duly acknowledged to be independent, and had bishops sent to them. When (in 1830) Belgium, after only fifteen years' trial, broke away from Holland, Roman Catholics helped strenuously in the creation of the breach, and no one heard any whisper of disapprobation from Rome. In 1848,

<sup>1</sup> '*Officieuxment*,' as distinguished from '*officiellement*.'

<sup>2</sup> Dollinger, pp. 436, 437.

Pius, the reforming Pope, had recommended an emperor, the Emperor of Austria, to give up the Lombardo-Venetian provinces, and not to attempt to govern them against 'the will and conscience of the inhabitants.' In 1859, Pius, the reactionary Pope, received from an emperor, the Emperor of the French, a letter, saying: 'That the Legations could now only be retained in obedience to the Papal See by a prolonged military occupation: and that this could give rise only to a continual state of rancour, discomfort, and fear.'<sup>1</sup> He, therefore, recommended (as he had once done in his earlier day, when an exile in Italy) the cession of these provinces.

Roman Catholic divines, if we are not mistaken, justify the summoning of foreign aid in cases where there is intolerable oppression, failure of all constitutional means of redress, and (which bears upon the cardinal virtue of prudence) a reasonable chance of success. The two last conditions the Romagna certainly possessed; how far the amount of oppression they had borne could be pronounced intolerable is no doubt a fair and open question. There can, however, we think, be little doubt but that it was *far greater* than had been undergone by Belgium or by the Spanish provinces in South America.

It is right to say that Dr. Döllinger, whose admissions are so large and from whom we have quoted so copiously, is on this point as indignant against the Italians as any one. We differ from him with regret, but it must be observed—it has struck several others besides us—that this great, learned, and powerful thinker is still *Germanorum Germanissimus*, and possessed with a spirit of very considerable contempt for the Italian mind, and an intense distrust of Italian statesmanship. Here, for the moment, we part company. We cannot read the narrative of Azeglio or Farini, or his own admirable summary, and say that these provinces have suffered nothing. We cannot look at the facts of recent history or read the manifestoes of Pepoli, of Ricasoli, or Boncompagni, and pretend to discover why the first King of the Belgians was justifiable and Victor Emmanuel only the fit subject of a *quasi-excommunication*.

Dr. Newman, of course, goes in this matter to the full as far as Dr. Döllinger. He appears to draw a distinction between the case of the Romagna, 'the northern portion of the Pope's states,' which (he admits) 'threw off his authority;' and the case of Umbria and the Marches. After paying great attention to the evidence, we must aver that we are unable to perceive any very broad line of demarcation between the two cases. It would require whole pages, if we were to go into the evidence with any

---

<sup>1</sup> *Moniteur*, 11th January, 1860. Cit. ap. Döllinger, p. 437.  
NO. CXXXV.—N.S. P

degree of fulness. But, although it may be true that the agricultural population of the more southern districts was less anti-papal (we mean, of course, politically) than the Romagna, yet we should like to know *what single town did not* favour the Italian side? That it is a real hardship, for a minority to be compelled to give way, is most undeniable. But this is only what happens everywhere; and we must repeat our conviction that the whole question is to be judged, as it would be judged in reference to the dominions of any other sovereign, as for example the King of the Netherlands in 1830.

Sir John Simeon, as is well known, thought that the advice of Napoleon III. was good, and had better be followed. For this act of boldness (the more remarkable, no doubt, as coming from one who has changed his religion) he was at the last general election vehemently opposed by Dr. Ward. This last gentleman thought it better to side with a singularly anti-Roman candidate than to support a co-religionist, who had ventured to express such sentiments. And yet the *non possumus* has not always been the Papal creed in this respect. Not only have the city of Avignon and the Comté Venaissin been resigned to France, but at the treaty of Tolentino the line of demarcation was drawn far less favourably for the Pope than it was in 1814. Whether Dr. Newman is in any degree now inclined to accept Sir John Simeon's view, we do not pretend to judge. We will give his words, and leave this point to the reader:—

'Past outrages such as these are never to be forgotten, but still they are not the occasion, nor do they give the matter, of our present prayers. . . . I understand, then, that the exact object of our prayers is, that the territory still his should not be violently taken from him, as have been those larger portions of the dominions of which I have already spoken.'—*Sermon*, pp. 35, 36.

Before, however, returning to our citations from the *Annuaire*, we would beg a very special attention to the following admission, which seems to us a most important one, when it is considered from whom it comes:—

'Not that I would deny that *there are sincere Catholics so dissatisfied with things as they are in Italy, as they are in Rome, that they are brought to think that no social change can be for the worse.*'—*Ibid.* p. 30.

As for the Roman Catholics generally, we are astonished at their apathy. They employ the most tremendous language, and contribute next to nothing. They claim to be 200 millions. Let us suppose that 150 millions are too poor to give one farthing more than they do give. This would leave 50 millions of contributors to a fund for making up the loss from the severed provinces. If each gave annually one franc for this end, the Pope's revenue would be 50,000,000 francs, or 2,000,000*l.* sterling.



We pass by the question of monasteries, as it would demand an article by itself. At present we will only ask : 1. Do monasteries, which have done their duty, fall unregretted? 2. What is their real condition in Italy and in Sicily? 3. Is Italy worse in this respect than Spain, Portugal, France, Austria?

We return to our citations.

1858-9.—Conduct of the Italian Government in the Romagnas. Conduct of the *Papal troops at Perugia*.

‘The Government in the Romagnas made the most moderate and honourable use of their powers, especially in the immediate assumption of as much of the debt of the Pontifical Government as was connected with the freed provinces. But not the less for this were they attacked with most odious calumnies by the official press. [N.B.—This was in the interval of Romagnol self-government.]

‘The Abbess of the Benedictine Convent at Verrucchio, and the Bishop of Rimini, each wrote personally to the official journals, to protest that they had never been subjected to the slightest violence. . . .

‘The Pope (lastly) begged the faithful to pray “that those misguided men might be led to weep, not over lying and imaginary massacres at Perugia, but over their own blindness and sins.”—*Annuaire*, tome ix. p. 282.

‘In reply to that, M. Tiberio Berardi devoted himself entirely to the task of carefully verifying the statistics of those events. He sent to many papers (in free countries) the most exact details ; numbers, names, ages, sex, of the persons killed by the Papal troops [in Perugia] *after capitulation*; he even omitted all those who preferred silence to any mention of their sufferings, and also all who were but slightly wounded.’—*Ibid*.

‘The numbers were, eighteen men and four women killed ; five men and two women wounded. For this performance Signor Berardi (with six others) was condemned to death ; but they were happily saved by being absent.’—*Ibid*.

‘We will only (further) mention a disturbance at the University of Rome. This was caused by an address expressive of devotion to the Holy See, wherein had been surreptitiously inserted the names of several persons who had expressly refused to sign it. The indignation aroused hereby was so great that several of the students had to be expelled, the rector dismissed, and the University closed.’—*Ibid*. tome x. p. 432.

1861-2.—Character of the Papal regiments as given by the French commander, General Goyon.

‘It is true that General Goyon . . . showed no more deference towards the Pope’s soldiers. Their excesses sometimes compelled the French authorities to protest ; and the inhabitants of the provinces, remaining under the Holy See, complained sorely of their official defenders. One, indeed, of their own officers, Major Piccioni, in an order of the day, published at San Gregorio on the 17th January, was forced to reproach his soldiers severely ; to reprove them for “their drunkenness, their bestiality, their slanderous and immoral conversations.” He added that “they did not always respect even the House of God.” These excesses obliged General Goyon to send French troops to Frosinore and several other places. . . . And it was to pay such troops as those that faithful Catholics were sending considerable subsidies !’—*Ibid*. tome xi. p. 231.

Attack of the Pope on civilization. Things which he did and which he did not see in his dominions.

‘Pius IX. in the Consistory of March 18th, 1861, attacked civilization in general. . . . Solicited at that meeting by the French, Bavarian, and

Austrian prelates to leave Rome, he refused on the score of his age and increasing infirmities, and of a certain sense of duty, which impelled him not merely to remain in the capital, but defend it, and induced him to preside in person over gun practices. Whatever may be thought of these military preparations, whose powerlessness is so evident to unprejudiced eyes, it might well be regretted that Pius IX. did not pay visits to his prisons as well as to the camp at Tor-di-Valle; he would then have seen with his own eyes the abuses which had at that very time just been revealed to Europe, in a lamentable report by M. Pepoli, Royal Commissioner for the Marches and Umbria; the delations, floggings, madness, long intervals intervening between condemnation and punishment, the most deplorable hygienic conditions, the immoral coupling together of common criminals and political *détenus*. Such was the sombre picture drawn by M. Pepoli, and which the Papal Government affected utter disregard of, *because it came from an enemy.*—*Ibid.* pp. 231, 232.

#### Charges against the Italian army.

‘In a speech on that occasion [a secret consistory for naming various Cardinals], Pius IX. had alluded to the reports so industriously circulated by the anti-Italian party, of acts of ferocity and brutality committed by the Italian troops. Five priests at Teramo (it was asserted) had been torn from the altar, and (with their pontifical robes still upon them) had been beaten till the blood flowed. Canon Fabri, secretary to Bishop Milella, had been shot. The former of these two assertions had already been publicly contradicted by the Archdeacon, twelve canons, and four parish priests (*curés*) of Teramo, and the second by the *curé* Spinozzi, who had never left the Bishop’s side.—(See his letters, 25 and 26 Sept.)—*This one example will suffice to show to what extent the Pope is duped by the interested and most untrustworthy assertions of those about him.*’

The following is curious.

#### 1862-3.—Events consequent on the death of the King of Portugal.

‘The Holy See was not always so successful, even with Catholic Governments. . . The death of the young King of Portugal had been officially announced to the Vatican by M. d’Alte, resident Minister of that Power, who had demanded, on behalf of his dead master, the honours usually rendered by the Church to deceased monarchs. This request, addressed to the Pope himself, was sharply refused for the reason of Dom Pedro’s having died out of communion with the Church. It will in fact be recollected that he had consented to the secularization of the property of the convents of nuns, and that some persecution, of the very slightest and most inoffensive character, had been undergone by some French Sisters of Charity at Lisbon. M. d’Alte had recourse to Cardinal Antonelli, hoping to find him more conciliatory than the Sovereign Pontiff; but the Cardinal Secretary of State declared he was incompetent to meddle with an affair which concerned religion more than politics. After exhausting all attempts at conciliation, M. d’Alte demanded his passports, received them with some astonishment, and left Rome; but when it was discovered at Rome, that in his turn the Nuncio residing at Lisbon would have to quit Portugal, the Vatican understood that some concessions must be made, unless it desired to break successively with all the Catholic states. . . . The Pope consented to announce the death of Dom Pedro (of which he had refused hitherto to take any notice), and to appoint a day for the funeral honours usually paid at Rome to departed sovereigns.’

We have purposely laid on one side a large quantity of similar material. We have also abstained from any appeal to Atto Vanucci’s powerful book the ‘Martyrs of Italy,’ because

we have no desire to employ evidence which, however carefully got up by a learned man, is, from the very nature of the work, not calm nor unimpassioned. And though we feel it to be almost unfair, we reserve at present the long letter of Canon Reali, which is lying by us translated for use.

It will be a change if we now invite the reader to study for himself some passages from the pamphlets of Perfetti, Giorgini, and Passaglia. We are by no means certain that these able and high-toned writers prove their case. Possibly, as Caleb Balderstone was determined to assign all losses of the house of Ravenswood to the great fire at Wolf's Craig, so these distinguished men may be unconsciously inclined to make the Papal temporalities responsible for everything. But we give these extracts, because, after all, it is far more important, that our readers should know what such men are thinking, than linger over any lucubrations from our pen.

If in the following passages from Perfetti's '*Ricordi di Roma*' a grain of satire be apparent, it is not the thousands who admire Dr. Newman who can justly quarrel with such an element, or deny its compatibility with piety and earnestness. Perhaps some persons may recognize the truth of the following sketches of the English and the French traveller in Rome, and of those whom he meets:—

'The foreigner who arrives at Rome sees scarcely a single Roman, and makes no effort to see them. His first desire is to see the ruins, the museums, the churches, the functions: next he visits the archaeologists, the artists, persons who usually are alike careless and ignorant of present events. If he be rich and gentleman-like, he knows the cardinals and the prelates; and they show themselves to him full of affability, of politeness, of kindness, and of a sort of senile excellence that reminds you of your father, and of your departed grand-parent. All are ready to bestow upon him that benediction of the aged which can harm no one. Our Englishman (every foreigner who spends money at Rome, is called an Englishman) is quite touched, and feels himself impelled to love them, and seek to see them again: and behold his love becomes admiration. Those excellent old men and their youthful attendants are not monks of the desert, but persons full of prudence, toleration, and wit: they touch you just where you like to be touched, they admire English freedom, Russian power, but they fall into the arms of the generous French.

'Tea comes, they "are keeping a fast day, but had thought of cream and sweetmeats for their foreign guest;" the amiable heretic will receive from Monsignore (before he can even ask) tickets for all the Holy Father's functions in Holy Week. The cardinals and the prelates take good care to cause no scandal, and also not to be scandalized by any earthly thing.

'The foreigner, if he had been ever so suspicious at first, changes his mind, and decides that they are the best set of people he ever saw in his life. . .

'But beside the cardinals and prelates, our Englishman will know some of the lay aristocracy, rich and thoughtless, speaking a sort of half-Italian half-French; even more cosmopolite than the priests, and more desirous to know what is the present fashion in matter of horses and dress, than to know anything of their own city; allured and confessed by the Jesuits—who rule them in everything, and flatter them like so many cardinals. There is nothing of firmness, nothing of perseverance in these princes. After those prudent

priests and those noble fools, our foreigner has the lower grades of society. He sees perhaps citizens, if you choose to call them so, but only as shop-keepers, lodging-house letters, and such like. The best thing he can think of those persons is, that they are only foreigners like himself, as indeed a large proportion of them are. In his pride at the intellectual, moral, and political elevation of his own people, he despises all those Romans and Romanesques, and easily decides that their priests are even too good for such as them. Envy of our ancient greatness makes him exult at our modern degradation, as Leopardi observed. The foreigners pay us to be what we are, what matters it to them what has made us such? The priests rule us as we ought to be ruled for the diversion of those who come to pay us. . . . To the foreigner, what matters the corrupting of the people, when that people's rulers set out a feast for him? . . . Perchance, if pride be silent in him, perchance he may feel sympathy for the struggles of those who think it hard to be thus for ever playing a part; but it is a passing sympathy, and soon fades.

But even this compassion is not felt by the *Neo-Catholic* travellers, who usually (I may observe parenthetically) are Frenchmen. The *Neo-Catholic* may be a priest or a layman, a revolutionist or a pure mediævalist. The revolutionist is a troublesome guest, discontented and noisy, who speedily either departs or gets converted. The latter is by far the more probable if he falls into the hands of the Jesuits. . . . The non-revolutionary layman is even more egotistic than the Englishman, and tells you openly that he came to Rome to dream (*pour rêver*). He is enchanted at its desert-like appearance, enamoured of the fearful rags that ask him for alms, and goes into ecstasy if a friar by chance salutes him in the street. The instant he reaches his hotel he sets about his reception by the Holy Father; ever after, he can speak of nothing else but, "*notre Saint Père qui m'a distingué*." (Our Holy Father who so specially noticed me.) If he sees a cardinal, he instantly snatches off his hat and cries, *Ah Monseigneur!* The Romanesque, who scents him out at the first sight of him, takes care always to call him '*Monsieur le Marquis*,' . . . and the conceited Frenchman swallows the fief. For the rest, he always talks liberalism, only not for Rome: Rome must remain what she is, for the interests of France, but above all, *pour la vie spirituelle de Monsieur le Marquis et de Madame sa femme*. If you bewail the miserable condition of the Roman Campagna—he says, it is most perfect for hunting foxes . . . and he laments . . . or rather did lament a year or two ago, the loss of the excitement of brigandage.'

The next passage is from the same writer; but it is taken from the more serious work named at the head of this article:—

'It is a grievous sight, and one which should afflict every Christian man, to see the Roman Court and its partisans misusing religion for the support of temporal interests; but it is a sore thing, and one which causes horror, to see that such an abuse is not a scandal to every conscience. On the contrary, he is proclaimed an enemy to the Church who objects to violence; a Machiavelian, he who is indignant at the mixture of sacred things and secular; a wolf, he who refuses to let himself be devoured: on the contrary, he is a lamb who desires to devour; a good Catholic, he who is an enemy of Italy; a saint and a hero, he who fights among brigands in Naples! Who does not sorrow over such a state of things so inexplicable at first sight? To whom does it not bring a presentiment of indescribable disasters for the Catholic Church? And meanwhile those upon whom the responsibility lies, care for nothing but present interests, and appear not even to perceive the real situation of things. . . . To crown all the excesses of clerical teaching, there has arisen the new *papolatria*. Faith is made to consist in a vapid mysticism, and the Pope is become the Church. The new council is composed of the editors of the *Monde*, the *Armonia*, and the *Civiltà Cattolica*. There existed in Italy,

whilst the Italians were struggling to regain their lost political freedom, bishops who dared to suspend all clergy who wished for the independence and unity of their country; and those bishops had the hypocritical baseness to declare to those clergy that they had loved their country like Him who, going to Golgotha, lamented that He could not gather under His wings all the children of Israel. Yes, those bishops had the hypocritical baseness to declare that they had an absolute unlimited right to suspend whomsoever they pleased, of the lower clergy, without assigning to them any cause whatever.

‘When the guarantee of non-removability for the judicial magistrate is recognized by the liberal legislative ordinances of the State, will it be endured that in the legislative ordinances of the Church, whence liberty is banished, there should be gradually introduced the Oriental notion that the priest shall be removable from his office at the good pleasure of the bishop? And let it not be feared that the concurrence of the people in the government of the Church will produce religious fanaticism, since, to speak only of the principal matter, the elections [of bishops], the power of election may be confided solely to men of mature age, not easily deceived or led into excesses. I also consider that it would be well if the government (whilst restoring to the faithful their rights) were to insist on some qualifications for eligibility,—amongst others, that the candidates should have studied in the national universities. So far from suppressing the faculty of theology in the universities, it would be very desirable that Catholic theology should by their means be supplied with all that scientific apparatus of which Protestantism makes so much use. *The decay of theological studies in the Catholic countries of Europe is a notorious fact*; and who is not aware what a great assistance learning is to true piety and wise moderation? Whereas ignorance is ever extravagant and full of fanaticism; the most learned priests are usually the most favourable to civilization. Do you believe that if we had now amongst us the Muratori, the Spedalieri, the Fontanas, the Genovesi, and the Gerdils, the Italian clergy would be so unjust towards Italy, would be so easily manageable by the Cagianis and the De Mérodes? By little and little, amongst Catholics, the seminaries have become the sole institution for the education of the priests; and what can be expected from the seminaries, when they are multiplied till they are as numerous, or more so, than the dioceses? And as though it were not enough that philosophic and theological studies should have so decayed in the seminaries, there is already begun (and it is unavoidable but that it should continue, so long as the present condition of our clergy shall last) a considerable discrepancy between the study of the humanities and of the elementary sciences followed by the youthful clergy and those of the laity. The seminary seems invented on purpose to make of the young priest a foreigner among his own people; priests are made nearly in the same way that Mamelukes were in Egypt: if the laity retakes its legitimate share of authority in the Church, I have no hesitation in saying that the seminaries will be either abolished, or at least profoundly modified.’—P. 43.

‘One of the gravest faults of the Catholic clergy within these last centuries has been the withdrawal of the Bible from the hands of the people. The Protestant populations, in the opinion of impartial witnesses, are more religious than Catholic ones, thanks to their continual study of the Bible, and yet they only possess scattered and meagre fragments of truth. In the Catholic populations religious feeling is overlaid and well-nigh annihilated, or lost in the flood of superstitions. There is nothing more opposed and inimical to the true spirit of Christianity than superstition; scarcely even heresy. Heresy destroys itself, but superstition destroys religion. Christ was vehement and indignant against the Pharisees, who had placed themselves on Moses’ seat, chiefly because they had encouraged and permitted the growth of superstition amongst the people: and how many Pharisees would He find

now? Let us return to the Bible, to the Gospel; let us all study deeply the perfect holiness of our Redeemer; He is the pattern by which we are to shape our course; He, who is at the same time a pattern, human and divine. Ah, it is only because we no longer study the Life of Jesus Christ that men are found who dare to draw comparisons between the sufferings of the Just One who died to save the human race, and the regrets of a Pope who has lost a throne! How can one who is ignorant of the Life of Jesus Christ comprehend the histories of the martyrs? And it is from this it comes, that a French bishop has profaned that Name, blessed in heaven, to honour those who by dread of arms, by dread of haughty threats, in African garb, fought against a nation which had never injured them; fought with a people whom their brothers had supported on the fields of Magenta and Solferino. The excesses of *papolatria* have perhaps been permitted by God in these days in order to recall us all, pastors and flocks, and before all the highest of all, to the exercise of sincere humility and Christian charity. . . . I have inquired of all those Christians, to whom what is seen and felt is but as it were a shadow, of those Christians who in the life which is passing away thought only of the life which endures, I have asked them by what path they had attained to Jesus Christ and peace. Some pointed to the Bible, some spoke of the traditions preserved in the writings of the Fathers, some repeated, with the mystic in his simplicity, *Via Crucis via lucis*; but scarcely one mentioned the priest, and if he did, that priest had reached the truth by the same paths. The official clergy, the high clergy, had had but the slightest and most insignificant share in those truly supernatural conversions, in those conversions which can in fact be explained only by having recourse to God's grace.

'This is a most serious fact; the priest no longer converts: I speak of true and real conversions, of many conversions such as were effected by Paul or John, or by the catechist of Alexandria. The modern priest no longer appeals to the nobler faculties of the human soul, but to sensibility and fantasy. The modern priest is no longer fitted to heal the soul's sicknesses, to say to the leprous, *Arise and walk*; he is only sufficient for the cure of fanciful persons, for whom religion is only variety of sentiment, a something which excites the imagination, a romantic reminiscence, an easy superstition, a resource, like many others, against the weariness of idleness. Look at the devotional books published in these days, from the "*Via Facile del Paradiso*" (Easy Path to Paradise) and the "*Arte di guadagnarlo*" (How to find it), down to the little religious tale or novelette: and call to mind the clerical eloquence of the present day, so showy and vain: and as superlative in manner as it is wretched in matter. Read, in one of the few weighty books written by a Catholic pen in these recent times, "*Les Pouvoirs constitutifs de l'Eglise*, par Bordas Dumoulins," to what extravagances the thoughtlessness of some prelates has carried them, and one would be driven to blasphemy, if there were not the excuse of ignorance.'

Our next quotations shall be from Filalete—that is to say, as we cannot doubt, Passaglia. The principles asserted in them are weighty and important; but it must be owned that their application is far from easy:—

'Father Taparelli (Sag. Teor. n. 680), demonstrating that a dispossessed prince, whose return to his throne has become morally impossible, has lost his right to the fealty of his subjects, remarks: "If that prince were to address his former subjects thus: 'I have the right to make your happiness, but I have not the power: you have the right to be happy, but you cannot hope it from me; give up your happiness in order to preserve to me my right to



make you happy :’ what reasoning would that be, or rather what want of reason ?”—P. 42.

“Following these principles, the truth of what Count Montalembert wrote in his pamphlet “*Pie IX. et la France*,” cannot be denied : “We have never considered it necessary to profess the dogma of the indestructibility of power, to believe in the exclusive right of princes over peoples, to look on the destinies of nations as indissolubly bound to certain dynasties, or to a certain order of succession. On the contrary, it is quite allowable to hold, and as for myself, I ever have held the doctrine which the majority of the European states, Sweden, England, Portugal, Holland, Belgium, and Greece, have consecrated by their example, the doctrine, that is, *of the necessity of the people’s consent to the government that rules them*. But there is a vast difference between this doctrine and the revolutionary dogma that this consent, once directly or implicitly given, may be perpetually questioned or withdrawn, without the gravest cause.”—P. 44.

‘But the conduct of the Roman Court, from its flight to Gaeta to the present time, has done away with the necessity of considering this question, it being useless to discuss the merits of an event which is henceforth doubly impossible, since the Pontiff, by determinedly resisting both the counsels and the wishes of his people, has sufficiently evinced his intention not to reform the State, and even if now he were willing, it would be late, as reforms granted on compulsion lose their salutary efficacy, and justly cause the fear that on the first opportunity they will be withdrawn.

‘It will be said, “But experience is against you, since, despite that so much boasted public opinion to those fundamental articles of the laws, we have seen, and still see, the Church spoiled of her rights.” And I say, in reply, that, on the contrary, both contemporary history and that of the past is entirely with me. I do not deny the facts, but I explain them by two observations. 1st. It is a common fact in history, that when two parties in a society dispute the field, it never happens that they keep within the limits of moderate defence ; but once the victory is gained, the conquering party will be juster and more generous towards the vanquished. 2dly. The Italian populations were not educated for freedom, and cannot be fitted for it but by time and the experience of their own mistakes. Thus it is that there are formed in the minds of a people those true and moderate principles of freedom which constitute public opinion the guardian of the rights of each individual. From these two considerations I conclude that the annoyances undergone by some clergy in Italy have had these two general causes, *i.e.* the opposition of clerical party to the Italian movement, and the inexperience of the mass of Italians in the career of freedom.’—P. 60.

From Giorgini, a layman, well known to the readers of ‘Giusti,’ we will only give a single passage :—

‘It will be said that the one thing has nothing whatever to do with the other ; that the evil does not proceed from the two qualities being united in the Bishop of Rome, but from the error of those who, blinded by passion, are unable to distinguish between them. Granting this ; is this distinction so easy that every one is able to make it ? I will confine myself to the narration of a recent occurrence. In 1848, it was said that the Austrian bishops threatened to withdraw from the obedience of the Pope, if the Pope persisted in the war against Austria, and that, precisely on account of that threat, the Pope did withdraw from that war. I do not know whether the report was true ; but I do know that it was said and believed at the time, and that the clerical journals related it without the slightest expression of disapproval, not seeing anything blameable in that shocking threat, which, from a war declared against Austria (that is, from an act of the sovereign, an act purely political),

derived a motive for refusing obedience to the Pontiff. The Liberals, therefore, it appears, are not the only people who are unable to make this distinction; there are prelates and *monsignori* who were not able to make it. *Let us not have two weights and two measures.* If, to save Rome from religious schism, the Pope did well to make a political schism, ought he not to do something to check this, I will not say Protestantism, but most certainly infidelity, *nothing-ism, which is making such fearful progress in the capital itself of the whole Catholic world?*

One only shall be given from the remarkable volume of Boncompagni. It bears upon the title of Dr. Newman's sermon, which stands thus: 'The Pope and the Revolution.' Now, as logicians tell us, words often *connote* a great deal more than they *denote*. The change that passed over Italy during the last eighteen, and specially during the last nine years, is, beyond all doubt, a revolution; and yet we think that Dr. Newman's choice tends, though it may not be intentionally, *ad augendam invidiam*. The word 'revolution' has been apt, ever since 1793, to suggest to the British mind the execution of a king, the overthrow of Christianity, the Reign of Terror. This, and a great deal more, is what, in many minds, the term *connotes*:—

'I have never felt so proud of being an Italian as when I saw that our revolution, begun in 1846, and developed after 1859 (that great revolution which has involved an immense change of the whole condition of our country), progressed without ever being overcome by the passions which have in most instances misled the judgment of other nations placed in similar difficulties. I would not have the prevalence of *pretophobia* diminish this glory of Italy. . . . Italy, in this respect, has been placed in an exceptional position. The first origin of her revolution goes back to 1843, when Vincenzo Gioberti and Cesare Balbo, followed by Massimo d'Azeglio, began to write on political matters. And by that word revolution, I do not understand either tumult or sedition: I understand a substantial change in the ordinances of a state, without reference to the forms in which it is produced. The essential difference between states under despotic lordship and those under a free government consists in the fact that the former repel, whilst the latter admit, free discussion of political affairs. This is the great power of our times; and wherever it has opened a way for itself, none can prevent its becoming master of the field. For this reason, when Charles Albert gave a benignant toleration (which in those days, and in that constitution of the state, was equivalent to protection) to the "Primato d'Italia," and the "Prolegomeni" of Gioberti, to Cesare Balbo's "Speranze d'Italia," and Massimo d'Azeglio's "Ultimi Casi di Romagna," he inaugurated a reform far greater than those for which the multitude, four years later, applauded him so enthusiastically. In the writings which gave the first impulse to the Italian revolution, there was no indication of passion or prejudices hostile to the Church. Few Catholics were more zealous than Vincenzo Gioberti and Cesare Balbo. And Massimo d'Azeglio (the first Italian of this century who made a formal act of opposition to the temporal government of the Pope, without having to go into exile) was ever reverent to the power of the keys. . . . But the applause with which the whole nation greeted them [Pius IX.'s amnesty and reforms] proves how earnestly it desired to proceed along its path of progress in harmony with the Papacy, proves how alien it was from all passions and prejudices hostile to the Church. Times were considerably altered in 1859, when the Romagnas withdrew themselves from the temporal government of the Pontiff, even before

they were completely freed from Austrian troops, the sole force whereon that government had stood. The country was left entirely to itself, with no government sufficiently strong to repress the excesses of a multitude most inimical to the clerical régime: many, indeed, had prophesied that there would be a murdering of priests. The quietness with which everything went on was a striking proof of the conciliatory spirit that animated the Italian revolution; devoid of the passions and prejudices which had been aroused by revolutions elsewhere. . . . To that open discussion I leave my speech. Accustomed to be ranked by the Catholic party among the enemies of the Church, I shall not be the least surprised if the *pretofobi* put me among the clericals.'

We owe a deep apology to the reader, whose patience we may have wearied, for the crude and inartistic manner in which these pages have been thrown together. We shall not, however, detain him for a much longer time.

Dr. Newman tells us that there are more Roman Catholics who are loyal and energetic, in word and deed, in England than in Italy. Neither the author of the 'Apologia,' nor M. de Montalembert (witness his recent eulogy) will deny that there are also many earnest Christians in England, who are *not* Roman Catholics. Well, then, does not all this tend to show that the entire system on which Italy has been managed for the last half-century—nay, for the last three hundred years—is one tremendous mistake? Spain is the only country that has had a similar régime, and what at this moment is the state of Spain?

We are deeply conscious that this paper must, after all, be to a considerable extent an *ex parte* statement. Not only our prepossessions, but likewise our very sources of information, have been, in a great degree, one-sided; and yet we have tried to read with care and thoughtfulness some of the defences.

There is, for instance, Archbishop Manning's sermon, 'The Temporal Power of the Pope.' Of all that is said concerning Dr. Manning's unworldliness, loftiness of character, personal fascination, and zeal for what he believes to be the truth, we make no question whatever; but we must frankly aver that in the only three controversial pamphlets of his that we have read (this and two former ones on a different subject) he seemed to us like a man speaking on subjects which he had not really studied, to an audience which he felt sure had not studied, and would not study them. We may, some day, if we can find leisure, try to point out what seem to us the weaknesses which render detailed examination of it unnecessary. To have classed it with Dr. Newman's sermon, as a text-book for our commentary, would, in our judgment, have been unjust to Dr. Newman.

Then there are the French defenders of the temporalities. Some years since we studied with much care the arguments of MM. Guizot, de Falloux, de Montalembert, and de Broglie. Always excepting the last-named, there is displayed by most

of these authors one characteristic that is a mistake, and another that is intolerable. The mistake is, the belief that the priest in France and the priest in Italy are the same person, and occupy precisely the same position. On this head let M. Charles de Mazade speak :—

‘For the last sixty years, whoever on the other side of the Alps opened his heart to a patriotic hope became of necessity a liberal, and whoever opened his mind to a liberal idea was unavoidably made a patriot. Hence has arisen a feeling which is, so to speak, only the natural and bitter consequence of the two others, and which is perhaps the most striking feature of public life in the Peninsula [Italy]. I refer to the almost universal, profound, and rooted antipathy to priestly government and to the temporal power which is only priestly government concentrated, raised to its highest pitch. This antipathy beyond all doubt reigns from the one end of the Peninsula to the other in all classes who are connected with political life, and is perhaps heavier in the former Pontifical provinces than anywhere. It will be recollected, that in 1860 it required the intervention of the French troops to retain, under the Pope’s sway, Viterbo, which had spontaneously voted its own annexation to the kingdom of Italy. That was very easily explained. What, in point of fact, did that temporal power or that priestly government represent in the eyes of Italians? They only saw in it politically, an invariable obstacle to all national independence, an interested ally for Austria, an ally of foreign rule raised on the ruins of Italy, and covering, as it were, with the sanction of religion all the most intolerable reactionary movements. Antipathy to clerical preponderance is thus become one of the forms of hatred to the foreigner. And the feeling has been the more intense and bitter, because mingled with deception in the remembrance of the early acts of Pius IX.

‘But this is not all. This antipathy to priestly government has indeed another cause; it is also caused by that abuse of clerical influences which has for so long a period and in a manner legally altered, denaturalized, and oppressed civil life beyond the Alps. It is easy in France to be liberal, tolerant, or (to speak more correctly) just, towards the Church. The French clergy have been born in a society fashioned by the revolution, and have known no other. They are under the influence of a whole body of laws, which limit their action and confine them to their purely religious duties. If they quit that sphere they are immediately watched and suspected. Quite the opposite is the case in Italy, the country of ancient clerical rule: there, the priest interferes in everything, penetrates into the heart of families, arranges private interests: nothing is done without his opinion. He holds simple souls, who are pretty numerous, by means of the sacraments, or of all sorts of superstitions, and the *esprits forts* by fear. As for civil law, in the old Pontifical states for instance, I do not know where it was; Rossi searched for it one day without discovering it, although he had been Professor of Jurisprudence at Bologna, and even Dean of the Faculty of Jurisprudence at Paris: it consisted in fact of priestly power, sometimes punishing the breaking of a fast, exercised by means of a minute and simply despotic inquisition, and most frequently placing spiritual authority at the service of political. And when we consider that the ecclesiastical organization of Italy at the present day, comprehends (not including the territories still subject to the Pope) two hundred and thirty dioceses for twenty-two millions of men, and that in addition to these there are all the religious bodies of every kind, we see what must be the irritating nature of a power which possesses at the same time both spiritual and temporal means of action. The Bishop of Orleans and Cardinal Bonnechose, and many others, have often said very hard things of the Italians. I should much like to ask either of those prelates,

what he would say if he were desired to hand a report of the confessions received in his diocese to the Emperor next time he passed through Orleans or Rouen. That, however, is what has been taking place in Italy. On the day of Victor Emmanuel's first entry into the kingdom of Naples, amidst all the usual commonplace felicitations between one government and another, he received a curious confidential communication. An ecclesiastical dignitary approached him, and requested, in a low voice, to be told to whom henceforth the report of confessions was to be transmitted. Victor Emmanuel listened without much comprehending what was said to him: he had to ask an explanation a few minutes later, and was disgusted at the communication.<sup>1</sup> There was the reason why King Ferdinand multiplied bishoprics in his dominions. He wanted auxiliaries.

'There were suspicions at Rome of some such thing; there were disquietudes every time requests for new bishoprics arrived from Naples; but in the end they were not refused.

'The hatred and aversion which such a situation has produced towards priestly government can scarcely be conceived . . . and it reaches straight to the temporal sovereignty of the Pope, as to the source of the evil, as to the supreme visible expression of the inundating clerical preponderance in civil life. . . .

'This hatred of the temporal power of the Church, this demand for civil emancipation, is therefore a patent fact, I venture to say an unavoidable invincible necessity, on the other side the Alps: but let no one mistake it, it is only hatred of the temporalities; it is not hatred of the priest because he is a priest, nor of the Roman Pontiff as the head of religion. . . . The antipathy of the Italians stops where clerical government stops, and religion begins. And their own practical good sense undertakes to make the distinction.'—*Revue des deux Mondes* for December 1, 1866 (pp. 735, 736).

The intolerable feature is their almost avowed disregard of all interest in the happiness of the Italians. Indignant at the fact, we have tried to consider what palliations might be made for the writers. We called to mind that they were Frenchmen, that the *amour propre* of the nation was excessive, and that they had long cherished a sort of traditional jealousy of Italy; and, therefore, because we regarded this as a foreign sentiment, it was matter of deep regret to us to find it referred to by an English writer with apparent complacency. Speaking of the city of Rome, Dr. Newman says—

'It is the religious centre of millions all over the earth, *who care nothing for the Romans who happen to live there*, and much for the martyred Apostles who have so long lain buried there.'—*Sermon*, p. 44.

'Who care nothing for the Romans who happen to live there'! But is this right? Is it the teaching of that John Henry Newman, who, in striking verse, in yet more striking prose, taught us of old to ponder so deeply on 'The Individuality of the Soul'? And surely 'the Romans who happen to live there' have souls; and though it is perfectly intelligible that men

<sup>1</sup> We wish to state most explicitly that we reserve our acceptance of this terrible story until further proof has reached us, and that we earnestly trust that it is false.

should make *some* sacrifice for the good of others, yet venal officials and lawless decisions can hardly be a necessity for the good of other people's religion. Dr. Newman says, indeed, that the Romans are a singularly stiff-necked generation, and he proves his position from the language of S. Bernard. But was that great doctor a prophet? *Must* the Romans of our day be regarded as so ungovernable, because their ancestors were such, when most nations were such, in a rude time seven hundred years ago. 'The people in the Papal states are not,' says Döllinger, 'judging of them by those endowments which they possess in common with other Italians, difficult to govern. . . . Human nature in the Papal states is not different from what it is in all other parts of the world.'

What Christian but must desire and pray that the Great Head of the Church would overrule—not as *we* might wish or expect, but according to that which He, in His infinite wisdom, knows to be best for Christendom—the events that are passing before our eyes. A soldier poet, who died fighting for Italy, uttered the following strains, some twenty years ago:—

'The Church shall reign resplendent  
But of earth's trammels free,  
And gentle, and similar to  
The Heaven she unlocks :  
And bravely, etherially,  
She shall smile on Liberty.

'Herself renewing and the humble  
Earlier virtues re-assuming ;  
She shall win back wondrously  
When she is Spirit, the members  
Now sever'd from her, and "one"  
again  
She shall embrace all peoples.'

'Starà la Chiesa splendida  
Ma vergine di terra  
E mansueta e simile  
Al Cielo che disserra :  
Ed animoso etereo  
Sorriso a Libertà.

'Di sè s'innovi, e l'umili  
Virtù primiere assembri ;  
Ripiglierà mirabile  
Quando fia Spirto, i membri  
Da lei divisi, ed unica

Le genti abbraccerà.'<sup>1</sup>

Solemnly and humbly, in such wise as Christ shall will it, we say to this prophecy, *Amen*.

And here, perhaps, our remarks would naturally come to a close, but that we find it impossible to avoid expressing the regret with which we take up any controversy that brings us into conflict with Dr. Newman. It is not the mere fear of proving *infelix . . . atque impar congressus Achilli* ; for a good cause, and the powerful aid of religious and richly-gifted auxiliaries, may go far towards placing the merest stripling on a level with the giant. But it is impossible for us to forget that this Review is in some sense the offspring of that movement, which for so many years had John Henry Newman for its *coryphæus*. Among the pupils

<sup>1</sup> Poema of Alessandria Poerio. (Firenze : Le Monnier, 1852.)



in that school there must be those who will well-nigh—perhaps in some cases, wholly and altogether—transfer the solemn words he employs respecting Thomas Scott, and speak of him as the writer, ‘to whom (humanly speaking) they almost owe their soul.’ There will be thousands more who recognize (to repeat words published by us some twelve years since) ‘those marvellous ‘gifts of head and heart which erst held them as if spell-bound ‘and enthralled, imparted to them fresh views of life, taught ‘them much concerning themselves, much concerning the world ‘around them, still more concerning the world unseen,—knowledge that cannot perish, thoughts that must abide with them ‘their whole life long, lessons of whose teacher they cannot but ‘think, when, with good Bishop Andrewes, they thank their ‘Maker for all who have benefited them by their writings.’<sup>1</sup>

Nor will it lessen their gratitude if they consider, as many well may, how much too (in a lower sphere of excellence) they have learnt as regards power of expression from the greatest living master of English prose. Many a one, probably, amongst us, if he has ever had the good fortune to be praised for beauty of diction, might be tempted to say to Dr. Newman; as the great Florentine says to Virgil,—

‘Tu se’ lo mio maestro, e’l mio autore :  
Tu se’ solo colui da cu’ io tolsi  
Lo bello stile, che m’ha fatto onore.’

Not in these pages will be found any sympathy with the attack which drew upon its author that overthrow, than which the history of literature tells of few so swift, so terrible, so complete. On the contrary, we have read with deep satisfaction and delight, the many tributes of the British press to Dr. Newman’s worth, more especially that most beautiful one by Professor Shairp in our contemporary, the *North British Review*; and the striking passages in *Macmillan’s Magazine*, which sound almost like the language of apology.

But neither respect, nor admiration, nor gratitude for past services, ought to suffer us to pass in silence a publication which seems to us calculated, however unintentionally, to mislead the public mind. As Plato said of Homer, ‘a man must not be honoured before the truth;’ as Aristotle said in turn of Plato, that ‘where both are dear, it is righteous to give truth the preference;’ even so would we now strive to feel, and we would fain repeat with them, ἀλλ’ οὐ γὰρ πρό γε τῆς ἀληθείας τιμητέος ἀνὴρ . . . ἀμφοῖν γὰρ ὄντοιν φίλοι, ὅσιον προτιμᾶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Christian Remembrancer* for January, 1855.

<sup>2</sup> Plato, *De Repub.* Lib. x. p. 595, c. *Aristot. Eth. Nicomach.* Lib. i. cap. 6.

And, in our judgment, this discourse, despite its many beauties and comparative moderation, yet does not, as a whole, set forth the truth. We are far from denying that there is a case to be made out on behalf of the Papal temporalities, or from thinking that our Roman Catholic fellow-Christians can be blamed for employing all fair means for their preservation. It is likewise very possible, as we have already admitted, that some Italian writers, both among deceased historians and living critics, may have fastened too exclusively on the Papal royalty as the one sole cause of many evils which they deplore; may have overlooked the services which it has wrought for Europe in the earlier Middle Age; and the splendour and protection which its possession has, at certain epochs, won for Italy. On our dissent from Dr. Newman's estimate of the spiritual authority of the Pope we do not dwell: that feature of the case has often been discussed in this Review, and, as our title proclaims, it is not our present theme. But we certainly do conceive it possible that a 'Papa Angelico' might arise, who should fulfil the theories put forth by the ablest defenders of the temporalities,—Dupanloup, Guizot, Döllinger; who should set forth an example of states well-governed and in harmony with all the really good features of modern civilization.

But at present such theories look like the merest day-dreams. As regards the dispossessed minor sovereigns, French advisers (M. Guizot amongst them) recommended the Italians to wait and see whether the Dukes of Parma, Modena, and Lucca would not mend their ways. 'In that case,' replied Passaglia, 'we should have had to wait until the day after the general resurrection of the flesh.' We beseech our readers to consider—not what *we* have said, but what has been laid before them in the shape of extracts, and thence to form their own opinion as to the length of time that the inhabitants of the Romagna might have had to wait, if they had trusted to petitions and remonstrances alone. Now Dr. Newman's discourse is calculated to impress upon the mind of those who heard it, or of those who read it, that all the wrong-doing is on one side only. Its very title, as has been observed, may convey a false impression; the concluding words of its appendix declare that the occupation of Umbria and the Marches was 'the old Fable of the Wolf and the Lamb.' Let our readers judge of the fitness of this comparison.

There are those among the members of Reformed communions, who practically, though sometimes half-unconsciously, address us in a spirit of this kind: 'Be charitable to Wesleyans, to Presbyterians, to Baptists, in a word, to all "who profess and call themselves" Protestants; but do not, as you value peace and a good name, exhibit any tenderness or charity to-

'wards members of the Greek and Roman Churches, because if 'you do, you are wrong.' Everywhere, we trust, and at all times, and at all risks, shall we earnestly repudiate these narrow and most unchristian sentiments. We are members of a Church which teaches her children to pray to Christ for deliverance 'from *all* uncharitableness;' and a tacit limitation of this petition in any direction is, to our minds, most foolish and most culpable. If any portion of our own remarks (for the writers of passages quoted, having been summoned as witnesses, must be mainly answerable for themselves) shall be thought by impartial judges to sin against charity, we shall sincerely regret the fault. But beyond this we cannot go. For all that is oppressive and unjust, for all that is sophistical or unworthy, we desire to cherish a righteous scorn and hatred: nor can we abate one iota of such feelings, because the agents of that which merits the severest reprobation may happen to be the bearers of titles which indicate a high, or even the highest, place in an ecclesiastical hierarchy.

If, which we do not anticipate, any opponents should think it worth while to indite a formal reply to this disquisition, there will be plenty to plead the cause of John Henry Newman, plenty to demand justice for Pope Pius IX. We rejoice to think it. But there are others also for whom we demand justice. We sue for it on behalf of that great nation, from which we in England have received so much; to which, until of late years, we have repaid so little: the nation whose missionaries in the earlier Middle Ages wrought so well for our improvement, spiritual and temporal; the nation which gave us the light of her schools of law at Bologna and Amalfi, and of her school of medicine at Salerno; the nation which led the van in painting, in sculpture, in music; which nurtured the founders of modern literature, such as a Dante and a Petrarch, whence our own Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Milton drew their stores; the nation which adorned the sphere of physical science with the great names of Galileo and Torricelli, Volta and Galvani.

We ask for that nation, that it be judged with calmness, and with fairness, by the side of other peoples. Let there be taken into account all that it has suffered during the last half-century, and let its conduct beneath those sufferings be judged accordingly. Let its soldiers, its statesmen, its sovereign, be weighed with those of other nations. Let that Royal House, which, in its long line, has never yet produced a cruel or cowardly ruler, be fairly measured with Hapsburg, Bourbon, or Nassau. Let other premiers be placed side by side with Ricasoli. Let there be left—Italy may cheerfully leave it—to the judgment of an age, when prejudices and passions shall have died away, the

history of that resurrection of a free and united country, a country so rich in the virtues, the trials, the patience, and self-denial of every class, so comparatively free from those stains of blood and crime, which too often mar the splendour of triumphs in themselves the most beneficent.

But if there be a Christian bishop who keeps two weights and measures, who accepts the organic statutes passed at Paris, and condemns similar laws when enacted at Turin; who can resign, without a protest, all claims to the Venaissin and to Avignon, but cannot possibly make any terms respecting the Romagnas; who has never been known to utter one syllable of blame against the crimes committed by the Neapolitan Bourbons, but fulminates a *quasi* excommunication against the head of the house of Savoy; who allows the rite of civil marriage in Belgium and in France, and denounces the self-same thing in Italy; and who, when great principles are at stake, treats free speech in ecclesiastics on the temporalities, as one of the most heinous theological offences; who, when all-important principles are being striven for, can find pleasure in the babyish and impotent delight of calling a great realm 'the *sub-Alpine* kingdom;' and who utterly condemns, in 1866, that which he blessed in 1848, —then, from the judgment of such a prelate, that nation must appeal to the moral sense of Christendom, nay, to a higher authority than any upon earth, even to Him whose vicar, in a special sense, that prelate claims to be. 'The righteous Lord 'loveth righteousness: His countenance will behold the thing 'that is just.'

- ART. VI.—1. *Norwich Church Congress*, 1865. Authentic Report.  
 2. *York Church Congress*, 1866. Various Reports.  
 3. *Bishop of London's Charge*, 1866.  
 4. *The Law of Ritualism*. By the Right Rev. J. H. HOPKINS,  
 Bishop of Vermont. New York: Hurd and Houghton, 1866.

THE York Church Congress—sixth of the series—has followed those of Cambridge, Oxford, Manchester, Bristol, and Norwich to the region of past history, so we may make it the standing-point from which to survey some incidents of the Church of England at home. Two years ago, in speaking of the Manchester and Bristol Congresses, we pointed out that the real success of the movement would be tested in 1865 by the results of the Norwich gathering. At that time we were not without our apprehensions. The Bishop, himself a resident, was, at the first, confessedly not a very enthusiastic convert to the notion; Norwich Cathedral was not among the foremost in that reformation which is spreading from minster to minster over the land; and the occurrence of some difficulties in the chosen residence of Father Ignatius was not a wholly visionary anticipation. The die, however, had been cast, and in due time the event came off. All influences proved propitious. The Bishop of Norwich, resolved on being a fair, developed into a hearty, president. The Chapter, represented by a Canon of eminent practical ability and energy, was a thoughtful and generous host. Mr. Lyne was absent: good humour was predominant. The papers and discussions were of sterling quality; and finally, the Congress-book, admirably brought out by Mr. Hinds Howell—who as organizing secretary had won golden opinions—stood in brilliant contrast to the scandalously ill-edited, or rather unedited, volume which professed to be the record of the Bristol meeting. But above all merits the Norwich gathering carried with itself the ratification of Church Congresses as accepted by the Church of England in its corporate and dignified aspect. The presidency of the Bishop of Oxford at Oxford signified the secured allegiance of one bishop. When the Bishop of Manchester accepted the chair of the congress which was held in his cathedral city, and the dean and chapter opened the cathedral to the initiatory service, the recognition, as far as that diocese went, was made good. A similar recognition at Bristol was a fresh point gained. But at Norwich something more was achieved than securing the countenance of a fourth presiding bishop and a third dean and

chapter. In a spiritual aspect the great united communion in the cathedral (when the bishop celebrated) was to be noted with a white mark; but in a constitutional point of view this congress was witness to another change in the upward direction betokening success. At Manchester and Bristol the preachers had been deans—deans of renown, indeed, and pulpit power, but yet deans: at Norwich an archbishop was called in to be the preacher, and it was no secret that this was in preparation for himself taking the chair at the next gathering. To the recluse this might seem a small matter; but to any one who has cared to study the episcopal thermometer, and to master the freemasonry of caution by which a prelacy, appointed for the most diverse of reasons, under different influences and by different prime-ministers, contrive to keep the peace towards each other, the appearance of the Archbishop in the pulpit of the solemn minster of York, preaching to the great church-concourse, after the public Eucharist, was the symbol of the hierarchy descending from the now-imperilled fortresses of class exclusiveness and throwing themselves upon the free zeal, not of a promiscuous herd of dissidents, but of congregated churchmen confederate in the unity of order and church-communion.

The formal recognition which had been so marked at Norwich was still more pronounced at York. The President was the Metropolitan and Diocesan of the province and the city in which the Congress met—the preacher, the Metropolitan of all England,—while the united worship which the Cathedral, through its corporation, offered, was an embodiment of catholic feeling, such as we make bold to say no cathedral of England has presented, for we would rather not attempt to guess how long. On the first morning there was a plain early Communion, the Dean celebrating, which was crowded. The great matins service, at which the Archbishop of Canterbury preached, was heralded by a procession winding from the chapter-house and through the nave, in which, after a long file of surpliced choristers, and choirmen, and cathedral clergy, and then of Archdeacons and Deans (invited in virtue of their dignity to take their part in it), were a dozen Bishops of England, Ireland, the Colonies, and the American States; and after them the Archbishop of York, who came supported by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Primus of Scotland. On the whole eighteen bishops and archbishops, three times as many as at any previous one, were present at the Congress; but three of these were not in time for the procession. We dwell on this incident, not because we are weak enough to think that processions could regenerate the world or purify the Church, but because the possibility, and still more the actuality, of such a spectacle, viewed both in its ceremonial and its practical aspects, as what it was



and wherefore it came to be, is a landmark of Church progress which we should not forget to set up for the guidance of the future annalist. .

The Archbishop of Canterbury's sermon was the best composition of his which we have ever heard. He had evidently appreciated the breadth of the occasion, and had prepared, not the elaboration of some specific topic, but that which approached, though of course rid of the monitory element, to a Charge, not, as usually, to his own diocese, but to the entire communion of which he is senior Bishop. The discourse did not attempt high flights of rhetoric, but it was impressive from its simple clearness and the manly good sense with which the preacher talked of things by their own names instead of beating about for oratorical amplifications. On preceding occasions, the special and official worship of the Congress as a whole, ended with the sermon. At York, on the contrary, the Dean and Chapter both for the second and third days of the Congress converted the usual ten o'clock matins into an early choral communion, at which the Dean was celebrant. Some 400 communicants availed themselves of this privilege each time, in addition to those who were present at various celebrations in different parish churches. On these occasions the clergy who took part, either in the music or as assistants in the distribution, left the usual stalls and were ranged antiphonally in the sanctuary, so the choir became practically a nave crowded with devout communicants. To conclude, on the night of that Friday, which was in fact, though not in form, a fourth Congress day, a densely thronged evening service was held in the nave of York Minster, at which the hearty singing of hundreds of voices testified that in one city, at all events, the cathedral, its ways and its privileges, are at last known and prized by the people. At this service an impressive sermon was preached by the Bishop of North Carolina.

It is not beyond our scope to notice that, within a few days of the close of the Congress, its selected preacher, the Archbishop of Canterbury, was again before the world as the chief functionary in another notable ecclesiastical ceremony, when he laid the first stone of the Cathedral at Inverness, for the diocese of that bishop of Moray and Ross, who, as Primus of Scotland, was walking by his side in the York procession. Gratifying in itself as the incident was, and useful to the cause of Church progress generally, it has acquired greater importance, and has had its utility enhanced, by the silly outcry which the *Times* was misguided enough to raise against it, and unscrupulous enough to jumble with the hubbub which it was then beginning to stir up against the new 'ritualism.' So coarsely and ignorantly was the attack made, that the hand of the assailant stood revealed

as one who, except in the *Times* and in his own conventicle, was but little accepted as a prophet: and whose own civil position in London was obviously the exact counterpart of that which he refused to tolerate in Bishop Eden at Inverness. Accordingly, the *Times*, for once, found itself alone against the world, with only the *Record* to cheer it on; while every paper of the most discordant views which valued consistency, applauded the action of the Archbishop, and as many thousands heard of Inverness Cathedral as hundreds might have done had the description of its stone-laying been confined to the religious press.

The business of the York Congress was, as in preceding years, conducted partly in a central hall, and partly in rooms used for sectional meetings. At Norwich, the Gothic arches of S. Andrews' Hall, in which the gathering took place, greatly augmented the artistic effect of the *coup d'œil*, otherwise its acoustic properties were very bad. At York, strange to say, no room existed large enough for the purpose, and so a wooden Congress-hall with galleries was erected close to the minster. Picturesque in itself, this structure were really an ecclesiastical aspect from the series of the armorial bearings of all the sees in Great Britain and its dependencies with which the gallery fronts were adorned.

Of the Archbishop of York's initiatory speech we need not speak at length. It was very able and judicious, but it was rather devoted to ensuring the good conduct and success of the Congress in itself (which on the whole it quite succeeded in doing), than addressed to the Church at large, beyond and after the meeting. One passage, however, there was of general value, which was remarkably applauded, that in which the Archbishop broadly laid down the Church's right to convocational representation.

Both before and after the Congress, some persons, who are not the most absolute representatives of the Church peaceable, have been depreciating the York Congress for the alleged incompleteness of the list of subjects treated there, and the method of their treatment. We shall best test the importance due to this charge by examining the elements of the discussions in comparison with those of previous years. We have taken the trouble to tabulate the various subjects handled at the four Non-university Congresses, not distinguishing between those which were treated in full session, and those which were awarded to sections, and where more than one distinct topic was set down for the same session, entering each separately. Of course the managers of each Congress adopted its own nomenclature. But judging for ourselves as to the subjects which were absolutely or approximately identical, we find 34 sections of the Ecclesiastical Encyclopædia travelled over during those 12 days

of 4 years. At Manchester, 16 several topics were handled, 20 at Bristol, 11 at Norwich, and 15 at York. 3 of them in different terms appear at all the occasions, 3 more at three out of the four, 13 at two, while 15 make a single appearance. The questions which have excited sufficient attention to recur virtually on every occasion are :—

1.—M. Church Extension. B. Parochial Subdivision, Organization, and Action; Collegiate Churches in great towns. N. Duty of Church to Home Population. Y. Diocesan and Parochial Organization.

2.—M. B. and N. Church Music. Y. Hymnody.

3.—M. Supply of Ministers; and especially native Ministers for Colonial and Missionary Churches. B. Foreign Missions and supply of Missionary Candidates. N. The Duty of the Church towards the Heathen. Y. Colonial Church and Foreign Missions.

In the second class was one topic which lasted on from 1863 to 1865, and then was dropped at York.

1.—M. Progress of the Church in Ireland. B. Mutual Relations of the Church in England and Ireland. N. Position of Church in Ireland :—

While there were two which appeared on all the occasions, except the Norwich Congress.

2.—M. Lay Co-operation. B. Home Missions and Lay Agency. Y. Lay Agency; and

3.—M. Ruridecanal Meetings, Diocesan Synods, and Convocation. B. Synods of the Church. Rural Deans and Decanal Chaplains. [Noted at B. as separate subjects.] Y. Diocesan Synods in relation to Convocation and Parliament.

Of matters which only come twice up, we find at Manchester and Bristol :—

1.—M. Church Architecture. B. Church Architecture and Decoration.

2.—M. Free and Open Churches. The Offertory. B. Free and Open Churches.

3.—M. Augmentation of small Livings, and Tithe Redemption. B. Augmentation of small Livings.

Three that appeared at Manchester, and then slumbered till they were revived at York :—

4.—M. Management of a large Parish. Y. Best Method of attaching the Poor to the Church of England.

5.—M. Parochial Mission Women. Y. Ministration of Women.

6.—M. Day and Sunday Schools. Y. Sunday Schools and Catechizing.

Bristol and Norwich monopolise :—

7.—B. Increase of the Episcopate. N. Division of Sees.

8.—B. Revised Code and Church Training-colleges. N. Education of Poor in relation to Church and State.

Bristol and York have one common topic:—

9.—B. Social Hindrances to the Spread of Christianity.  
Y. Social Condition and Recreations of Working Classes.

Next come a cluster of subjects which have come into prominence at Norwich and York:—

10.—N. Court of Final Appeal. Y. Ecclesiastical Courts.

11.—N. Cathedrals and Capitular Bodies. Y. Cathedrals—their Work and Influence.

12.—N. Duty of Church towards Foreign Christians. Y. The Condition of the Churches of Western Europe.

13.—N. Adaptation of Preaching to Present Times. Y. Dogmatic Teaching from the Pulpit.

Of once handled subjects Manchester gives us:—

1.—Supply and Training of Ministers.

2.—Clergy Discipline.

3.—Growth of Church in Lancashire.

4.—Law of the Colonial Church.

Bristol:—

5.—Dilapidations.

6.—Education of the Clergy.

7.—Systematic Cultivation of English Composition, Reading and Speaking.

8.—Associations for Aiding Poor and Disabled Clergy, and their Widows.

9.—Church Finance.

10.—Middle-class Education and Bristol Diocesan Model Schools.

11.—Adult Education and Night Schools.

12.—Church in the Workhouses.

Norwich only gives:—

13.—Spirit in which the Researches of Learning and Science should be applied to the Bible.

York has:—

14.—The Sunday Question.

15.—Church Rates.

It will be seen that the three subjects which held their own through the full four years, have been the great questions of the Church at home in its parochial aspect, and of the Colonial Church in connexion, more or less, with foreign missions, together with that special phase of outward worship which has such fascination in different ways, both for high and low, namely Church hymnody, dealt with either in regard to its music or its words. Of those that were protracted through the first three con-

gresses, the Irish Church, after producing a very unseemly squabble at Manchester, thanks to Dr. McNeile's characteristic bitterness against the Romanists, was handled with peculiar ability and elevation of tone, both at Bristol and Norwich. It was, therefore, well not to risk a breakdown at York, by the fourth appearance of a fully-worked topic. Norwich, on the other hand, was noticeable for omitting the cognate questions of lay-agency and of synodical action, which were well handled at the other gatherings. The introduction of this discussion at York is no weak answer to the charge of shirking brought against that Congress. Our attention, as we turn to topics which only appeared twice, is drawn to the fact, that both at Manchester and Bristol, 'Church Architecture' ('and Adornment' being added on the second occasion) and 'Free and open Churches,' (in the former were coupled with the 'Offertory') are prominent topics; while in the remaining Congresses they totally disappear. Thus at the two earlier assemblies the ecclesiological phase of the Church movement received due attention, while in 1865 and 1866 it slipped out. We fancy that we need not go far for the reason of this difference. Since the Bristol Congress the so-called 'ritual' movement had made head, and had indeed appeared at Norwich and York, in the form of an exhibition, and at the latter city also as a simultaneous and separatist congress, while upon both occasions the formidable Association which fights the Free Church question with so much fierceness also held a rival gathering at the same time and place as the regular Congress. The consequence is that, at all events, between 1864 and 1867, the Church movement, in its ecclesiological aspect, will have become apparently separated from the main current of congressional deliberation, and turned into somewhat turbulent and rapid by-channels.\* Some people may hail this as the emancipation of honest opinion, for which we ought to thank the ultra-ritualists and the Manchester Free Church men. To this we cannot subscribe, while, at the same time, we decline to identify ourselves with the caution which avoided the examination of those topics, rather than allow that open discussion, by moderate men, of such of the incidents connected with them as would not involve the most thorny points of existing controversy. At the same time, it is fair to notice that the question of 'Cathedrals,' which makes its appearance in 1865 and 1866, is, to a considerable extent, cognate with the general subject of the grandeur of worship: on both occasions the ablest paper was that of the Dean of Ely. This subject, too, was heralded in 1864 by a paper and discussion on the collegiate system in large towns, as contrasted with the mainly parochial organization, a consideration professing affinities with that of the due nature and use of those most important

collegiate churches which contain a bishop's *cathedra*. The increase of the Episcopate was omitted at Manchester, but it had been handled at both of the University Congresses, and was again taken up both at Bristol and Norwich, so that its omission at York was not much to be wondered at, although, as it was so very practical a topic, and as the one Congress in which it had been passed over was the previous one in the Northern province, we think it might as well have been entertained. As it was, its omission created some disappointment, and elicited independent meetings during Congress days.

The topic of 'Ministration of Women' is an omission in the two middle Congresses, but it had been well worked at Oxford, and we hail its re-appearance at York. A somewhat remarkable group of subjects came exclusively before the two latter Congresses. We have already mentioned 'Cathedrals.' The appearance at Norwich of the 'Court of Final Appeal,' and at York of 'Ecclesiastical Courts,' is sufficiently explained by the Colenso case and Lord Westbury's infamous judgment. 'Foreign Christians' and the 'Churches of Western Europe' re-echo subjects which have most gravely agitated thought at home. The adaptation, dealt with at Norwich, of 'Preaching' to present times, and the consideration given to dogmatic teaching from the pulpit at York, were the congruous counterblast to the flippant religious talk of the age. While the masterly treatment of the latter topic by two Irish dignitaries, in the eloquent and sustained argument of the Dean of Emly, and the perhaps even more eloquent and epigrammatic, if not so closely reasoned, speech of the Dean of Cork, placed this session in conspicuous prominence solely from the quality of the oratory which it elicited, and the speciality of its having proceeded from a portion of the Church of which English churchmen are perhaps too apt to ask, Can any good come out of it?

Perhaps we ought to have grouped with the first-named of these subjects that session of the Norwich gathering which was pre-eminently the event of the Congress of 1865,—the one whose key-note was 'the spirit in which the researches of learning and science should be applied to the Bible.' Dr. Pusey's Essay, deep as anything which he has ever written, more lucid than many of his previous writings, was the paper *par excellence* of that morning; a paper which must have comforted many persons, by giving them a rational yet faithful solution of difficulties with which they may hitherto have been sorely troubled; while, perhaps, it also relieved in a lower sense some others who, having themselves reached the same conclusion, found that Dr. Pusey's broad ægis was raised to shield them from imputations of irreverence from more timid brethren. The tacit con-



sent of the Christian *orbis terrarum*, Catholic and Protestant alike, has in our own lifetime ratified the concordance of revelation and of true science by the recognition of the fact that the days of creation were periods of uncertain, it may be of practically incomprehensible, time. A fresh series of scientific facts has much more recently evolved bewildering difficulties in the literal maintenance of those very few thousand years during which the human race has hitherto been supposed to have existed. A little reflection was sufficient to show that no doctrine of the faith, no incident of scriptural history, was at stake in the discussion of the merely arithmetical computation of the probable duration of the human race. In fact, the more years we concede to the events of the Genesis, the easier we made it to conceive that the human race in all its diversity, ranging from European to Tasmanian, sprung from a single couple (the one great ethnological fact which has a theological value), and therefore that

‘Adam vetus quod polluit  
Adam novus restituit.’

Still, in face of Dr. Colenso, pious people might well not like to be the first to make this acknowledgment. It was accordingly true wisdom and true courage in Dr. Pusey to come forward, in behalf of all the orthodox, and offer the admission. One fact, which he worked with much power, was conclusive, that by comparison with the genealogies of the Old Testament the consecutive fourteens of the first chapter of S. Matthew were confessedly arranged, for reasons which we cannot grasp, in their symmetrical succession by the omission of actual links.

It might at first sight seem surprising that ‘Clergy-discipline’ and the ‘Law of the Colonial Church’ having been taken up at Manchester should afterwards have been dropped—but in fact analogous questions have been discussed at later dates, though we would not quite group the previous subjects as equivalents with any later discussion. The growth of the Church in Lancashire was a local specialty like which we wish there had been more on other occasions. The only similar topic which we can discover is the paper on the Bristol Diocesan Trade School. The practical character of the remaining once-introduced topics at the Bristol Congress, which we need not again recite, is a feature to be noted. The consideration of the relation of learning and science to the Bible was the only solitary topic which distinguished Norwich, while the ‘Sunday question’ and ‘Church Rates,’ which are alone recorded against the York Congress in this class, were not its most felicitous elements.

An extempore feature was introduced into the York gathering by the invitation from the Working Men’s Association for the

Congress to meet and address it. In consequence, the Congress Hall was crowded with workmen, accompanied with their wives, who were successively addressed by chosen speakers, such as the Archbishop of York and the Dean of Cork. The attention of the hearers was exemplary, and the speeches of a decidedly good quality. All we wished for was, that there should have been a little more distinct allusion to the Church as such, if only as a social organization. When the working men ask a Church gathering, as such, to address them, the time had surely come to show them inoffensively and tolerantly, but still boldly, that the Church, as such, was in every way an institution which was of great benefit to themselves, and of which they would feel the loss were it to be removed. As it was, many of the speeches would have been nearly as appropriate at a Wesleyan or Baptist Congress.

Upon the whole we should say that the Manchester Congress was characterised in its choice of subjects by a bold, though rather unsystematic, grasp of large questions; that of Bristol by the desire to realize practical points; Norwich by a well-balanced system of carefully adjusted topics; and York by business-like caution. After all, however, the bill of fare in any case, like that of many a Corporation feast, is more truly comprehended by the retrospective inquirer than the bewildered participant. As we have shown, the feature of the York Congress which will stamp it with individuality, was the fulness of the recognition which it won from the Church itself in its established dignity. As three days cannot cover every thing, it was worth making the list of subjects which secured the Primate of All England as preacher in York Minster, less than five years after the first little Congress gathered at Cambridge in King's College Hall.

We have called attention to the discussion on the ministration of women. Not many weeks after the discussion, the Bishop of London's Charge, recognising the need and the work of Sisters of Mercy, *eo nomine*, was delivered.

'Time was, and not long ago, when Roman Catholics were supposed to have a monopoly of Sisters of Mercy: when Protestants all held that women might work as true Sisters of Mercy (and thank God they can), one by one, from their own homes, visiting amongst the poor and desolate in their own neighbourhood; but that the system of our Church forbade any organization for a combined effort to use the services of women. The fearful emergency of the Crimean war dispelled this theory. Other efforts were doubtless being made before, but that melancholy time changed public opinion. The heroic spirit who stood forth to guide, and those no less brave who seconded her efforts, told the world that English Churchwomen were ready to combine, where combination was needed, for any great Christian work; and our hospitals will probably always henceforward bear more and more, the better they are administered, the impress of that great example. Now I should be false to all good

feeling if I did not publicly testify to the great help which London received, during the late appalling sickness, from the self-denying efforts of Christian women—some acting alone, on the impulse of their own individual generous nature, some living in communities, of which it is the common bond to be ready, for Christ's sake, to tend the poor at whatever risk. . . . But no doubt those Christian women who work in communities are still viewed, by the great majority of the clergy, with considerable suspicion. Would to God they would abstain from all practices which make these suspicions reasonable! The number of sisterhoods of the Church of England throughout the country is very great. The deaconesses who form themselves on the model of the Protestant Institution of Kaiserswerth are, so far as I can ascertain, as yet comparatively few. The time has, I think, come, when the clergy generally and the heads of the Church must enter fully into the question how the help of Christian women living in community, and holding themselves ready to act amongst the sick and poor, is to be best arranged. We have amongst us a large body earnestly desirous of giving themselves to such work. . . . If family duties are overlooked, God's blessing can never be expected on any efforts which we may make for His Church. Every community, therefore, of sisters or deaconesses ought to consist of persons who have fully satisfied all family obligations. Again all who enter such communities must be at full liberty to leave them so soon as the leadings of God's providence point to another sphere of Christian duty. Hence all vows of continuing in the community, actually taken or mentally implied, are wrong. Again, the rules of the community must be simple and carefully guarded, so as to check all imperiousness in the higher, and all unworthy and unchristian servile submission in the lower, members. Again, great care must be taken to guard against morbid religious feelings and opinions, which all experience shows such communities have a tendency to foster.'

These are the words of a non-High-Church Bishop, won, unwillingly it may be at first to his convictions, by the pleadings of practical necessity; every thing therefore that he says in approbation is doubly valuable, while his warnings deserve respect, as the original criticism of an acute bystander. Anxious as we are to attain the general recognition of woman's united action under religious rule, in works of religion and mercy within the Church of England, we feel bound to call attention to the difficulties about organizing the system under which female societies can act, when the constitution has, on the one hand, to avoid any occult love of spiritual power, and on the other to beware of that romanticism which is apt either to colour the joint action of men and women, even when it is of the purest and most sacred character, or else to permeate the inner daily life of the Sisterhood itself. Accordingly we commend these remarks of the Bishop of London, not to the acceptance, but to the calm consideration, of all who are actively engaged in the development of sisterhoods. On one point we do not hesitate to declare our adhesion to his warnings. So long as the Church of England so emphatically ignores, and the spirit of religious people throughout the land is so unmistakeably opposed to vows, it is suicidal in policy and indefensible in principle, to underlay the recognised constitution of sisterhoods with any clandestine obligation

of vows, imposed by the stronger upon the weaker side. Between the *disciplina arcani*, which must be maintained by the imposer over the taker of the vow, and the conflicting external manifestations of spontaneous partnership which would have to be kept up by the Sisterhood to the uninitiated world, those must be feminine minds of the stoutest stuff which would not occasionally be led to feel that the path of straightforward duty within the community was rough and narrow.

It would be cowardice to take leave of the York Congress without referring to a very vigorous force of irregular volunteers who chose that city as the scene, and the Congress days as the time, of their operations. The exhibition of Ecclesiastical Art held in the spacious brick mansion of some Yorkshire magnate of the eighteenth century, with its attendant lectures and discussions, was the sequel of a similar appendage to the Norwich Congress. This year's display was, however, larger and more varied than that of its precursor; while archæology supplemented the array of modern chasubles in use, or for sale, with contributions of which not the least important were the Westminster copes, lent by the Dean and Chapter of the Abbey; while the papers and discussions, which were a novel incident, were carefully reported in the newspapers. As we have hinted already, the growth of the 'Ritual' movement may have had something to do with the absence of ecclesiology from the more recent congresses. At first sight, the new ceremonial seemed, from its York manifestation, to be carrying the day before it. It had, since the report, on the whole favourable, of the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation, gone on with only a little outside complaint of clerical coteries, and its bold display on the occasion was like a triumphal rejoicing. In the few weeks, however, that have intervened, the British lion has fairly been lashed up into a perturbation which, whether the result of genuine deep feeling, or of the strong desire to catch at some counter-excitement to banish the disagreeable images of Bright and Beales, cannot assuredly be dismissed with contempt by any one who desires to see the revival of Catholic principles in the worship, as well as in the doctrine, of the Church of England guarded from molestation during this season of popular agitation.

We hardly need say that we have never admitted the claims which the chiefs of the new ceremonial pertinaciously urge, to be accepted as the leaders of the High Church movement. They may be right or wrong, wise or unwise, scholars or sciolists; but the allegiance they have a right to is only that which they may win for themselves by the truthfulness, wisdom, and honesty of their principles, while their errors are not to be charged upon that great school of thought and those teachers of practice who during

the last thirty-four years have conducted the Church revival, through many moving accidents, to its present level of success. At the outset, we protest against the term 'ritual' as the accepted definition of their peculiarities, and against their naming themselves as the distinctive 'ritualists,' not only because the word 'ritual' as meaning 'ceremonial' is a mistake, but because, in the exclusive sense in which it is used by these new ceremonialists, it involves something like a repudiation of those multitudinous labours of love—in recasting Church arrangements, and developing choral services and reverential Eucharists—which have, for nearly thirty years, taxed the intellects and gladdened the hearts of so many loyal children of the Church.

Upon the abstract points at issue we desire to speak plainly. We never had any doubt that the Rubric of 1662, in its natural and unsophistical meaning, legalized neither more nor less than the vestments ordered in the First Prayer-book of Edward VI.—viz. a white alb, plain, with a vestment or cope, for the priest who celebrates Holy Communion, and an alb with tunicle for his assistants.

The opinions of the nine counsel consulted by the English Church Union, accordingly, sound to us as confirmatory rather of the candour of the Chief Baron, the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, the Queen's Advocate, the Attorney-General of Lancaster, and their companions, than as dicta which tell us anything of which we were previously ignorant. They certainly do not help us to understand the greatest of mysteries—the contrary opinion of Lord Justice Cairns and Sir Roundell Palmer. That these vestments are in themselves popish has always seemed to us a ridiculous calumny, seeing not only that vestments are of universal use in the Eastern Church, which is so antagonistic to Rome, but that in its Western form the chasuble is the prescribed vesture of the Lutheran communities of Sweden, Norway,<sup>1</sup> and Denmark. It stands in this respect in the same

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Forester, in his interesting 'Travels in Norway,' published in 1850, describes a Sunday which he passed in the summer of 1848, at the village of Lillehammer, when he was present at the celebration of the Holy Communion according to the Norwegian ceremonial. 'The priest having returned to the altar, the precentor invested him, over the surplice, with a rich vestment or cope [chasuble] of crimson satin, embroidered with a broad cross of silver tissue before and behind.' Mr. Forester adds in a note, 'I had seen them of velvet with gold embroidery, but the colour was invariably crimson.' Of course, his journey having been made in summer, he is not a witness as to, e.g. the Lenten colour. Further on he explains that wafer bread is used, while his own summing-up of the whole question—that of an educated and right-minded, but apparently not peculiarly theological English traveller of eighteen years back, when even S. Barnabas was still non-existent—is:—'As to the assumption of an additional and peculiar vestment in the celebration of the Eucharist, I believe the cope is recognised, and has been in use in our own Church since the Reformation.' (The italics are the author's) 'The use of the wafer, instead of leavened bread, is surely a matter of little importance; perhaps

category as the altar crucifix and lighted candles, which are of obligation in the 'Evangelical Church' of Prussia. As a matter of propriety, we quite agree with the Bishop of Oxford in his late Charge, that a distinctive dress for the celebrant at the Eucharist is seemly and desirable. Having said all this, not as a concession, but as the expression of convictions which we held years before the recent excitement, we may be allowed, without suspicion, to express our grave apprehensions at the results to which the authors of that excitement may lead the Church of England—results which ought to be as much objects of dread to them as to ourselves. These are not times in which the immutability and irrefragability of any statutable enactment—such as the rubric is in its secular aspect—can safely be assumed by any party as its vantage-ground for straining the application of that enactment, to its utmost legal limit, in the teeth of persons who bear no goodwill to the enactment in itself, and who know that constitutionally the same power which enacted can also repeal. Vestments legal, yet dormant, may not be a satisfactory condition of things to the man who desires to feel them on his own back; but vestments abrogated, and for the time to come illegal and irrecoverable, would be still less pleasant in his eyes. Moreover, we cannot blind ourselves to the suspicion that the inquiry which has been so peremptorily forced upon us may, after all, establish the fact that, excepting for the three earliest years of reformed vernacular worship, during which the First Prayer-

it is more consonant to the usage of the primitive Church and the original institution of the Sacrament.' It is obvious all through the long description from which we have taken these brief extracts, that any question of the validity of Norwegian orders had never occurred to Mr. Forester, while he confounded the cope and the chasuble. We can give a no less explicit account of the ceremonial of Sweden, a country which, it will be remembered—although since the treaty of Vienna under the same personal sovereign as Norway—has for centuries had an antagonistic political, and a distinct religious history (with the advantage to Sweden of a presumably valid episcopal succession). The *Ecclesiologist* for February, 1852, contains a letter by Mr. G. J. R. Gordon, for some time *chargé d'affaires* at Stockholm, and now minister at Stuttgart, describing the organization and ceremonies of the Swedish Church, in which we read: 'The priest is vested in chasuble and albe, on the former of which, consisting of rich velvet or brocade silk, (and, if of the former, generally red, except in Lenten time, when it is invariably black, with plain embroidery,) is embroidered, on the back, a plain Latin cross, ordinarily occupying the whole length and breadth of the vestment; whilst on the front is commonly embroidered a large glory, with a triangle, and the sacred name, in Hebrew letters, within it,—also of gold or silver work, according to the season. Beneath this chasuble is worn the albe, of white linen, with a broad embroidered and vandyked, or fine lace collar, and sleeves tightened at the wrist, being bound round the waist with a netted blue silk girdle or sash, and having round the bottom a fringe of broad embroidery or lace. These vestments are put on over the cloth, cassock-like coat worn by the Swedish clergy, and in which, together with the neck-bands, they are bound always to appear. Swedish episcopal vestments are of far greater splendour (including rich mitre, cope, pastoral staff, and pectoral cross). The rich vestments just described are worn only at the celebration of the Holy Communion.'



book was in use, the ruling rubric of that Book has never received a more than partial interpretation, even by those prelates and clergy of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I.'s reigns, who pushed to the furthest their own ideas of ceremonial grandeur. It must not be forgotten that the *continuous* formal existence of the non-Roman Church of England dates only from Elizabeth. The First Book contained a certain ceremonial, essentially and unhesitatingly 'Anglo-Catholic;' but in the same reign of the same boy, within a space of time to be measured by any one who will take the trouble of thinking what he was about three years ago, and of realising that it was three years since, it was replaced by another Prayer-book, edited under strongly adverse influences, while both books were equally, in another brief space, submerged by Mary's revival of the old system, which, good or bad in itself, had the *prestige* of far many more years than both the antagonist new rituals could together boast of weeks. It is accordingly but common-sense to own that it was *tabula rasa* at Elizabeth's accession, and that the actual force of the First Book, contrasted with its moral value, must be measured by the degree to which we can prove that it has been revived by Elizabethan and post-Elizabethan enactments. We believe that the person who duly considered these facts would have to acknowledge that, while copes have been, with more or less frequency, worn as Eucharistic vesture from the days of Queen Elizabeth to these of Queen Victoria, at whose coronation we, with our own eyes, saw the Archbishop of Canterbury celebrating in one, attended by the acting Dean of Westminster, also so vested, no undoubted instance after the time of Edward VI. of the use of a chasuble—however (as we believe it to be) rubrically and statutely legal—could be established. In fact, we suspect that, in the eyes of the seventeenth-century ceremonialist, the word 'vestment' had lost its technical meaning of *chasuble*, and was concluded to be an alternative or expetive expression for 'cope,' the special Eucharistic garb in which Andrewes and Laud, Wren and Cosin, were wont to brave the profane scoffs of the Brownists.

We do not assert, neither do we deny, that if a compromise had been offered, or asked for, or could now be effected, which should secure the unquestioned revival of the cope *simpliciter*, as the celebrant's dress alternative, and equally favoured with the surplice and hood, it might not be well, under existing circumstances, to close with it as the distinctive Eucharistic 'vesture' of the Anglican Church. We shall not be tempted to discuss the possibility of such an arrangement even from recollecting that a writer of eminence in the new 'ritualistic' school has put his name to the assertion that proof exists that in sundry English pre-Reformational Churches the cope was

the priest's mass dress. We only point out to the men of unflinching precedent, what might be the result in *non-Puritan* hands of the enquiry which they have been working so very hard to precipitate.

There are, however, other results, which no dread of ill-omened words ought to lead us to suppress, if happily we may, by pointing them out, urge any enthusiastic worshipper of a single idea, viewed from a single stand-point, to a wider comprehension of the symptoms of the age. The result might very likely be to place the settlement of the question not in the hands of the non-Puritans, but of the Puritans, who dislike from antagonistic partisan proclivities—or else of the Latitudinarians, who dislike from generic antipathy—both sacramental doctrine in itself, and of course also the external manifestations which exist on account of and in furtherance of that doctrine. Omit a symbolical rite, and you go far to obliterate the popular apprehension of the doctrine of which that rite is the symbol. It would be still more probable that these two classes of thinkers, finding that for the moment they had a common immediate object, would patch up an armistice and unite their forces to crush forms which are alike obnoxious to solifidianism and to pantheism. Would the people who belong to these two classes, and to whom any special Eucharistic vesture is especially offensive, agree to legalize and popularize the cope because their antagonists claim both cope and chasuble? Would they, with so fair an opportunity offered to them of meddling, be satisfied to leave the English service still capable of all the ceremonial amplification which it now receives, in so many churches where the introduction of vestments has never been thought of? They would have on their side all that peculiar strong feeling—not unmixed with a subtle, but deep-rooted pride—which makes the average Englishman always suspicious of the other Englishman who appears in some dress which he does not see his own way to put on. The surplice has indeed weathered its Symplegades, but after how many storms let the memories, on the one side, of Cartwright and Prynne, and on the other, of Laud and Charles, testify. Cope and chasuble, on the contrary, have not been fought and practically won on the many battle-fields which have shaped the Church of England, but rather the contrary, and so those who desire to establish them will have to begin at the same beginning at which the wearers of the surplice found themselves in the sixteenth century, without the certainty of the same result, if Exeter Hall and the *Pall Mall Gazette* should unite forces to their destruction.

But some of our gravest apprehensions of the result of the so-called 'ritual' movement, proceed from another cause than fear

for the result of a conflict between the world and the *bond fide* advocates of the full Prayer-book. We have made good our assertion that the attempt to revive the *summum jus* of the rubric—not so much from an abstract love of conformity for conformity's own sake, as from a liking for the things which that conformity would introduce—while abstractedly defensible, may practically be very impolitic, and provocative of great mischief on the side most disagreeable to its promoters; viz. on that of the retrenchment of advantages which have already been after an arduous struggle conceded to, and peacefully enjoyed by, the believers in sacramental worship, under a condition of things which has virtually compromised the personal adornment of the men for the embellishment of the fabric, and the regulation of the service. Such a policy, if it is to be pursued at all, must be done under the guidance of the greatest self-restraint, and the most patient caution. In proportion as the object is to reach nothing short of the absolute limit, the obligation must be imperative on the honest reformer not to transgress that limit. To be impolitic is a dangerous position to find oneself in. To be both impolitic and a trespasser into the fields where the law runneth not, is indeed perilous. Here, then, a new element enters into the consideration of the question as it is presented to us by the extreme wing of those who desire to confine the term 'ritual' to the ceremonies which they themselves specially patronize. We have begun by saying that as honest men we can personally, irrespective of questions either of policy as to their re-adoption or of intervening usage, give no other interpretation of those ornaments of the ministers, which were in the Church of England by authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI. and are therefore still legal by the Act of Uniformity of Charles II. of which our present Prayer-book is a part, than that of their being the much canvassed vestments. The nine counsel say the same thing. But the extreme ritualists cut the legal ground away from their own feet when they argue, as we have seen them do, with a pertinacity worthy of a more tenable cause, that this reference to the authority of Parliament in a particular year does not imply a certain book set up by a certain act of that year, but all the collective mass of antecedent usages which that book was in great measure intended to regulate and simplify. We are not now entering on the much wider question of the virtual allowance of that which is not specifically forbidden. We are merely pointing out the impolicy of the attempt to distort what to all plain comprehension is a leading instance of specific enactment involving specific limitation, into the recognition of a principle which without such limitation could not be worked as

part of the existing English system. The rashness of the proceeding is all the greater when the law which they are discrediting gives them specifically so much of that which they are seeking to obtain. We need go no further than this opinion of the same counsel for an instance of the spirit in which the English legal mind in its most friendly mood would deal with the question of virtual permission, by comparing on the one hand the consideration (irrespective of the results which they reached) which these eminent lawyers gave to the questions of wafer-bread, the mixed chalice, and of hymn-singing, and on the other the impatience with which they gave their voice against the legality of incense.

We are, of course, when we say all this, speaking as Anglicans, as men who live under the Prayer-book of 1662, and whose great ambition is to make that Prayer-book, to a far higher degree than it yet is, the living rule of Christian conversation within the land. We have not the illogical national vanity to say that all perfection is concluded within that service-book. We have on a former occasion stated points on which we should gladly improve it; and we could now—but will not—name others. But, in face of what it might have been in 1690, or at any moment during the eighteenth century, or even if compiled by the 'old orthodox' of the generation just passed away, or by any set of men in our own time, except that set which is most unlikely to have had the exclusive manipulation of the work confided to it, it is a priceless jewel. Touch it, and it will probably be spoilt—keep it, and the hope remains and grows that its legitimate resources will be further and further developed.

Plainly, then, we must state that some ultra-members of the extreme 'ritualists' have worked themselves out of the attitude of conservators of the Prayer-book as the palladium of our national Catholicity, into that of men whose feelings towards the book are identical with those of Mr. W. G. Ward towards the Thirty-nine Articles, viz. that of regarding it as malleable material which, by a series of 'non-natural' manipulations, they could work into forms unthought of by its compilers, but pleasurable to themselves. We seek, of course, the representation of extreme 'ritual' in the second edition of the '*Directorium Anglicanum*;' and there, mixed up in inextricable complication with the revived ceremonial of the First Prayer-book of Edward VI., we find a series of usages which claim our assent, not because they were ordered or allowed in the ruling rubric, or in any other one, but because, in the private opinion of some of those who have brought that rubric into vogue again, they are Catholic and congruous. Of these

we need only for example mention (not as the strongest case, but as one which is now prominently before the public) the revival, not of the sweet smell of incense, but of the overt gesture of incensing, as an integral element of the Communion Service and of other offices, which has just been declared to be illegal by the same consensus of eminent lawyers—who have allowed the vestments—with an emphasis of negation as trenchant as that of the affirmation with which they accept chasuble, cope, alb, and tunicle, because they stand written in that rubric, which is silent upon thuribles and frankincense.

We lay a strong intentional stress upon the overt gesture of incensing as contrasted with the combustion of incense, for there is a wide distinction between the two ideas, which the ultra-ceremonialists have somehow overlooked in their arguments. Incense, they urge, was a prominent element in the Jewish ritual; but it was found there as a sweet-smelling savour offered to God, and not as a lustration, so to speak, of the officiating ministers. To take up another very different line of defence, incense was occasionally burnt in the chapels of our prelates, and in some churches, and probably cathedrals, during the first century after the Reformation. But that incense, as it is quite clear, was burnt upon a kind of standing brazier, and its ministration was not a running accompaniment of the Communion Service. To come from the higher to the lower class of arguments, incense has an obvious practical value in all rooms, whether secular or religious, which happen to be stuffy: but then this incense need not be swung in a censer. Conformity to pre-Reformational usage is of course an argument of another kind; and from the standing point of the ritualists has its value in accounting for their practice of incensing. But we were purposely regarding the question apart from such considerations. The most complete example of the way in which 'incensing' can be attached without assimilation to the Anglican ritual, even as founded on the prescriptions of 1549, may be found in the way in which the new school amplifies the Rubric of Evening Prayer, which enacts: 'Then shall be said or sung the Psalms in order as they are appointed, then a lesson of the Old Testament as is appointed. And after that Magnificat (or the song of the Blessed Virgin Mary) in English, as followeth.' The analogous rubrics of all the successive Prayer-books are, we may note, substantially, though not literally, identical. In the earlier days of the Church revival, the battle of the choral service had to be fought in hundreds of places over the 'said or sung.' With the establishment of the natural meaning of the 'said or sung' came the recognition of a body of clerks to 'sing or say,' and of the surplice to clothe those clerks, while another rubric contri-

buted the chancels, which were to 'remain as they have done in times past,' as the places in which those clerks, so dressed, were to 'say or sing.' All this may seem humdrum to the fresh young ritualist curate, who has entered into the harvest which is due to the energy of those who through much tribulation have ploughed and sowed for the liberty of choral worship for the Church of England. Such is the reasonable and legal expansion of this and of similar rubrics. Now let us see how it is handled by those who in the 'Directorium' claim to be the leaders of the party of strict conformity.

'On Sundays and Festivals incense should be used at Evensong during the singing of the *Magnificat*, and additional tapers may be lighted. This canticle—a daily memorial of the Incarnation—being its special feature; some of those who are taking part in the service should indicate this by gathering together in front of the altar while it is being chanted, taking up, for the time being, such a position as that described here :—[A diagram follows] 'the officiating priest having had the thurible and incense-boat brought to him by two Acolytes, may silently bless the incense in the following terms : "Vouchsafe we beseech Thee, O Almighty God, to bless ✠ and sanctify ✠ this incense, and grant that we who are permitted to worship Thee in Thy courts on earth may hereafter adore Thee for ever in heaven. Amen." He then incenses the altar from end to end, beginning at the Epistle corner, going on to the Gospel corner, and returning to the centre, where, swinging the thurible from side to side for a few moments, he again incenses the cross, and then returns the thurible to the thurifer, who will proceed to incense (1) the priest officiant at vespers, (2) the assistant clergy, and (3) each side of the choir, and lastly (4) the congregation, first towards the north, and finally towards the south side.'

It will be noted that in the preceding page of the 'Directorium' the dress of the officiating priest is asserted to be cassock, surplice, and cope, and that of the assistants albs and dalmatics—all of them, except the surplice, dresses only authorized in 1549 for the Communion Service.

We venture no observation, favourable or unfavourable, upon the intrinsic dignity or unction of this service—as it really is—constructed out of the elements of the *Magnificat*, which the Prayer-book orders as an incident of its Evensong. We should strongly repudiate affixing any imputation of Romanising disloyalty upon the clergy who practise it because of their so doing. But we may ask what kind of strategists they be who have adventured to make good the practical realisation of the entire rubric to its extreme extent, and who encumber themselves upon their sufficiently difficult march with such impedimenta—so bulky, so unassimilative, so provocative of suspicion on the side upon which the Englishman is most suspicious and most unreasonable. But, as we have already pointed out, it is possible that there may be persons who do not particularly care for the resuscitation of the full English ritual as it is written in the English rubric; but who are determined to realise certain



practices because they think them Catholic, and because they like them. This position, if honestly avowed, is intelligible and consistent in itself. It explains many other peculiarities of the so-called ritualists. For example, it is the clue to the energy with which some of them attempt what the Puritans used to call 'fencing the tables,' by changing the great Sunday celebration from a grand common Eucharist of the faithful communicants, both clergy and laity, into a High Mass to be attended, but not participated in, by the laity.

But in proportion to the intelligibility of this policy so is its danger. It is perfectly idle to contend that this class of ritualists is conservative of the Prayer-book. It is infatuation to put them forward in the forefront of the battle against Puritan innovators, for they are, in their way, as complete 'revisionists' as Lord Ebury and his set, with the difference that the latter only talk, and the former enact, innovation. We do these ritualists the justice of supposing that they really desire to strengthen the whole Church of England, from their point of view, by effecting changes in the Prayer-book, which they have argued themselves into imagining the whole Church will accept, while we are aghast at the blindness to the tendencies of the age which can have misguided them into the belief that a change in the formularies of the Establishment, provoked, as any such revision must be, by the joint agency of themselves and of the Eburyites, would tend to the advantage of any section but that one which desires to uncatholicise the Prayer-book. Perhaps there may even be a few among them who would not be staggered at such a result, but who would look upon the contingency as the opening of the Red Sea, which would lead them to the tangled wilderness of a ritualistic Free Church, regulated by the free will of the ceremonialists themselves, uncontrolled by pope or public opinion. This would undoubtedly be a most logical consummation of the 'Directorium,' but it would be most disastrous to the cause of God's Truth throughout the land.

Here, then, we pause to appeal to the genuine and moderate men who have embraced the full ceremonial of 1549, because they think it their duty to show an example of strict conformity. We make this appeal, believing that they only want to make good in their own case the liberty of the Church of England to use legal vestments, under the conviction that the English people have only to be convinced of their legality to accept them rather than try to change the law upon which the sanction rests. We further appeal to them, under the conviction that they may perhaps have also taken up incense, or some other unusual rite, as a corollary of the vestments, without much consideration of the difference of the respective bases on which the two innovations really rest.

Are these excellent people certain in what company they are marching? Have they considered that the *plusquam* ritualist who looks on the English rubric as no better than a row of pegs on which to hang his own imaginings, is in reality the most dangerous antagonist of their position of absolute conformity? Have they ever looked on their guides as men who have gone the furthest in actively shaking confidence in the stability of the *litera scripta* of the rubric? Those who have made good their recognition of choral worship, and of the due appointments of the Eucharistic office, including the all-essential eastward posture of the celebrant, have so far travelled along the same road, although, from motives of policy and of charity, they may be stopping short of their companions who think the time has come for the revival of the vestments. But the men who organise Magnificats with incense and varied attitudes, who add Corpus Christi Day to the great festivals, and who strain all their energies to the converting of Sunday worship into non-communicant gazing on a high mass, are travelling along quite a different way, which may tend to the indulgence of their own tastes, either within the spacious park of Rome, or else the little back-yard of a private conventicle, but which will, if allowed unlimited swing, undoubtedly arrest the healthy growth of external worship within the great old Church of England.

One instance of the practical working of these notions which has lately come to light is so characteristic that, at the risk of being lengthy, we must pause upon it.

There have been from time to time incidents in the Church movement over which we have sorrowed as the indiscretions of earnest and simple-minded, but unworldly men, who rushed into predicaments, or were entrapped into admissions, calculated to provoke the ridicule of a cynical world. Many of the proceedings of good hot-headed Mr. Lyne, for instance, were incommensurable with any theory of current common sense. But in all our experience we never recollect a circumstance which more clearly shows that religious enthusiasm may exist, and yet the perception of the possible and the congruous be absent, than the reception which has been accorded to that erratic Frenchman, M. Jules Ferrette, ex-head of a Romanist college, and ex-Presbyterian Missionary in Syria, and now *soi-disant* Bishop of Iona, by virtue of an alleged consecration by the hands of one 'Julius, Metropolitan of the World, who is Peter the Humble.'

For M. Ferrette we do not pretend to care. He is clever, and he is versatile, as other Frenchmen have been before him, and Syrians too, long ere the Franks had overrun Gaul—so these qualities are natural to a Syrianised Frenchman. We do, however, care for the credit of the Church of England, and inasmuch

as a certain section of our own clergy have publicly identified themselves with his preposterous claims, we feel ourselves bound to show by his own confession what manner of man this Bishop of Iona who has come to rectify the catholicity of Western Europe, *now* is. We say emphatically *now*, for his backers, at a certain recent meeting in Jermyn Street, where he was exhibited to those who chose to go and see the spectacle, vociferously asserted that the question was not what the bishop might formerly have been, but what he now was. We protest most roundly against the principle involved in this assertion; but in the present instance we are quite content to abide by its results. M. Ferrette as he now is, painted by himself, is quite enough for our present purpose, of seriously appealing to that portion of the Church of England which desires to strengthen and extend the ceremonial appointments of our services to consider whether they do wisely to repose confidence in any guides who are making themselves conspicuous as M. Ferrette's supporters.

We cannot deal more fairly by that gentleman than by taking him at his own estimate of himself, given to the public within the last fortnight, in a letter dated December 17, and published in the *Church Times* of the 22d, with the signature 'Julius, Bishop of Iona.' Accepting, for the purpose of our present argument, the statements of this letter, we are willing to acknowledge that he is as much of an 'orthodox bishop'—his own definition—as can be predicated of a French Roman Catholic priest, who, after some thirteen years' conformity to Irish Presbyterianism has received, under unexplained and obviously irregular, if not clandestine, circumstances, the single imposition of hands of an ill-identified Bishop in Syria, who, by a process of reduction, must, if at all in *rerum naturâ*, be a bishop of that Syrian branch of the Eutychian sect which has vegetated on for so many ages as the Jacobites. M. Ferrette in fact, himself acknowledges as much in his letter, clouded as the confession is by a flight of incomprehensible words and unproven assertions.

Now, whatever may be thought of the virtual soundness of the faith of these Jacobites, they are tenacious, like all Orientals, of canonical prescriptions when not coerced by *force majeure*; and as Syrians tell us in the newspapers, one of their regulations is that a 'Syrian' or Jacobite bishop must be elected by three-fourths of the male inhabitants of his diocese, and then consecrated by the patriarch and two bishops. It is certain that three-fourths of the male inhabitants of that interesting but remote portion of the county of Argyll, Iona, did not elect M. Ferrette to be their bishop, never having heard of him; and it is nearly as certain that Iona is equally unknown to the 'Syrian' episcopate; while in the third place, there is an

absence of proof, and even of assertion amounting to proof on the other side that 'Peter the Humble' was not the Jacobite patriarch whose residence is Mardin in the province of Diarbeker, in spite of his self-assumed pompous title of Metropolitan of the World; while, as M. Ferrette even ostentatiously proclaims, his was a single-handed consecration. Finally, it is indisputable that at Homs (the ancient Emesa) there is no resident Jacobite bishop at all, whether Metropolitan of the World or of anything else; the nearest see of that sect being that of the village of Kuryetein, on the borders of the desert, about two days' journey, or sixty miles, from Homs,—of which, by the way, the diocesan is credibly reported to have been in Rome some few years since, and to have engaged for a consideration to conform with his flock to the Papal Supremacy.

Still we let M. Ferrette's statement, in which there is nothing materially impossible, pass; and we assume that some Jacobite prelate, of Kuryetein or elsewhere, was induced to go to Homs, and there, under the turgid pseudonym of Metropolitan of the World, to violate the canons of his church by a consecration, single-handed and clandestine, of M. Ferrette to a see in the remote Hebrides, long extinct by name, and already included in a diocese of the Anglo-, and a 'district' of the Roman-, Catholic Church, prompted and enlightened as he must have been in this grotesque performance by the urgency and instructions of the adventurous European priest, ordained in the Latin Church.

Such—to take the touchstone of what he is, and not what he was, either as Romanist, Presbyterian, or assistant in London to Mr. Marchmont, the dissenting sham clergyman—is the Bishop of Iona, who is thrust upon us by the *crème de la crème* of ritualists, as a chosen instrument in the restoration of Western Christendom to the purity of catholic faith and practice. Happily this suffragan of the World has not been slow in publishing to the West what privileges he has in store for those whom he may be happy enough to gather into his own most sacred fold. Modestly putting himself on the level of 'S. Basil and S. Chrysostom' in his letter of December 17, M. Ferrette observes, 'unless the Apostolic succession has been interrupted 'or the nature of the episcopate changed, the "sacred bishops" 'of our day have just the same authority of setting forth liturgies for themselves and their clergy as they had in the fourth century. If so, my publishing a liturgy is a legitimate episcopal act, fully warranted by ecclesiastical precedent *as well as by present necessity*' (these italics are ours). This Liturgy might have been, and we suppose was, in the hands of the Jermyn Street Conference; for it was not published at Homs, nor yet in Iona, but at 'Oxford and London,' by 'James Parker and Co.,

1866,' in the form of a thin book, of 12mo. size and 81 pages, with the title: 'Εὐχολόγιον. The Eastern Liturgy of the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and Orthodox Church, simplified and supplemented; containing Forms deemed valid and orthodox by all Churches for the worship of God daily throughout the year, and for the administration of all public ordinances, including Ordination. By the Rev. Jules Ferrette, of Damascus. Translated by the Author from his Greek Manuscript.'

A still smaller forecast had been published, also in 1866, by Messrs. Parker, entitled 'The Damascus Ritual, a complete Liturgy, extracted from the Greek Euchologium, and supplemented from the English Prayer-book,' also by 'the Rev. Jules Ferrette, of Damascus,' and professing to be a translation of 'his Greek Manuscript.' There is besides a preface to the second book, printed as a small separate tract, in which the professions of the title-page are expounded, and the assertion ventured that M. Ferrette is the one single person who has renounced Romanism without losing favour with his former superiors and brethren. It will be sufficient for our present purpose to take the second book, while, at the risk of being tedious, we repeat that the person exhibited by advanced ritualists in Jermyn Street, and admirably upheld by the Secretary of the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom, and editor of the second edition of the 'Directorium Anglicanum,' was at the time author of this Liturgy, which, as late as the 17th of December, he defends in the columns of the newspaper which is especially regarded as the organ of the most extreme ritualistic party.

What, then, is the new and true Eirenicon? Of what quality is that elixir of love which this spiritual Dulcamara vends as the infallible cure for the fifteen-hundred-years-old quarrels of the Universal Church? First let us see how the Scottish suffragan of the Metropolitan of the World 'simplifies and supplements' the Eucharistic Office. The book contains a 'Liturgy of the Lord's Supper,' according to S. Basil, for Sundays, and one according to S. John Chrysostom for week days. We will examine the former, which comes first, and has the fuller rubrics. The office is headed with a general rubric, which commences by asserting that 'it is proper that the Lord's Supper be administered every Sunday at the end of the day.' No doubt this sentence has received the cordial approbation of those friends of M. Ferrette who make themselves conspicuous by the zeal with which they vituperate those fellow Churchmen who do not make it an obligation to enforce fasting communion. But then his Hebridean lordship goes on graciously to concede the 'lawfulness' not only of 'more' but also of 'less' frequent administration, 'and at another hour, if there be some special reason for

it.' The ceremonial appointments may not be very gorgeous, but there is an elegant simplicity about them : ' before the administration of the Lord's Supper there should be prepared in the Church a table covered with a clean white linen cloth, upon which table is placed a plate, with a loaf of ordinary bread, and ' a cup of wine.' No ' pernicious nonsense ' here, it must be owned—no stone altar, no frontal, crosses, or candles, no wafer-bread, nor yet mixed chalice, nor indeed altar, paten, or chalice at all ; but table, tablecloth, plate, bread in the loaf, and wine already poured out in the cup. But we have not yet reached the end of this noble rubric. There is the apparatus—but what of the communicants and the celebrant ? ' The communicants stand before the table, and the bishop behind it, the face of the bishop being turned towards the communicants, and the faces of the communicants towards the bishop.'

After this mutual introspection, we reach the Office itself, after the remark, ' the bishop says.' It must be noted that this office, M. Ferrette's ' simplification ' of Eastern liturgies has resulted in his shaking up what he calls ' Public Service on Sundays ' out of our own ordinary dry Sunday offices, beginning with the ' One or more sentences,' and the ' Dearly beloved,' and ending with the prayer for the Church Militant (the Oblation being omitted)—the ' Gloria in Excelsis,' which is changed from the Western—without being converted into the Eastern—form, being tacked on. Accordingly, after the Versicles and Responses, ' Let us lift up, &c.,' and ' Let us give thanks, &c.,' we are introduced straight to an edited version of the ' Anaphora,' said by a ' bishop'—how dressed appeareth not—across a table, with a ' plate' and a ' cup ' on it, to a cluster of standing ' communicants,' so managed that it may either be taken as containing a consecration of the elements or a mere historical recital of the Last Supper. This concludes with the Lord's Prayer, after which the ' sacred bishop ' orders that ' the communicants sit down if there be accommodation for it,' but ' the bishop remains standing ' (why he should be compelled to put himself to so much trouble is not explained). After this, ' the bishop says—" The holy things to those who are holy ;"—' (and sitting, he might have added) ; and continues—" God, be merciful to me, a sinner." The bishop then takes the bread, and ' blesses it, saying, " Blessed be God." ' How this pious ejaculation is a benediction of the bread, being left obscure. ' The bishop then breaks the bread, saying, " Christ says : Take, eat, this is my body which is broken for you. Do this in remembrance of me."

The Order of Administration stands as follows :—' The bishop then, with great reverence and solemnity, distributes the bread to the communicants. And if there be one or more deacons



'present, they help him in the distribution. The bishop communicates last of all, as the Servant of the Servants of God.' We shall not waste words by commenting on the parody of humility which characterises the impudent inversion of all Christian tradition contained in the last order; we simply place in contrast to it the following extract from M. Ferrette's letter of December 1:—

"My episcopal character cannot be said to have 'nothing obligatory,' for the priest Belerosoff [the Russian chaplain at Brussels], and for his co-religionists. They are bound to recognize me as an orthodox bishop, though not as their own bishop; and it would be a grave sin for any of them to act, speak, or write so as to impede my work. But it is just that I should bear in mind my own weakness as well as theirs. When Romulus, after much difficulty, had contrived at last to surround his so-called city with a mud wall, Remus, his brother, thought it a good joke to leap over it, and Romulus killed him on the spot. I will be more patient than that, and continue my work nevertheless."

We thank M. Ferrette for the minute accuracy of his parallel. We thoroughly agree with him that *his* 'city' of God is but a 'so-called' one, and that its 'wall' is composed of 'mud.' We do not thank him for his patience, for, in truth, we do not care how impatient he may be, while we do not entertain the slightest doubt that he will 'continue' 'the work' in which he has shown himself so successful, of dabbling in mud. But in the meanwhile, we are forgetting the Liturgy:—

'All having partaken of the bread, the bishop and people continue engaged in silent prayer for some time; after which the bishop takes the cup, and gives thanks, saying, "Thanks be given unto God!"'

We call special attention to this passage to ask what that is, which the consecrated of the Metropolitan of the World proffers to the Catholic Church by way of a consecration of the element of wine? As we said, he travels over the *words* of institution in his Anaphora, but excising, as he does in that connection, any rubric of action, they may stand there merely as narrative, otherwise we should have a double consecration of the bread. The words of administration are ours with a prefatory 'Christ says,' after which follows a rubric, parallel to the one above quoted which orders the bishop to receive last of all. Then follows a short prayer adapted from the Greek Liturgy, after which 'the communicants then stand up, if they were sitting, and the people sing, or the bishop says,' the *Nunc Dimittis*. 'The bishop then raises his hands and dismisses the people with the blessing, saying'—no formal blessing at all, but the normal ascription of grace from the second Epistle to the Corinthians. Such is the Eucharistic service tendered by this upstart wanderer for the acceptance of universal Christendom in exchange for its existing offices and rites. It is not our business to test it by comparison

with the elaborate rituals of the East or unreformed West. Seeing the company in which we find Bishop Julius, we are driven to ask if it be so very superior to our own order of Holy Communion, even when most drily administered. In order to be quite fair to M. Ferrette we throw in his anomalous 'Public Service on Sundays,' as its earlier portion, and even then we find that, waiving minor points, (1) M. Ferrette never gives us any special Collect at all, and except on the Sunday before Easter, Maunday Thursday, Good Friday, Easter Eve, Easter Sunday, Ascension Day, and Whitsunday, no proper Epistle and Gospel; Christmas Day being wholly ignored in the Ferretian use, as a Holy-day at all, and the 'bishop' having the choice of readings on other days. (2) That he omits the special confession, solemn absolution, and the authoritative blessing; in (3) That he orders the communicants to sit during reception, and the celebrant to receive last, and (4), That he throws the very consecration of the elements into inextricable confusion. The only Catholic increment which can be set off against this astounding list of defects, is the mention of a prayer of Anaphora.

Our readers will not be surprised to be told that in the order of 'Administration of Baptism,' the words are turned into the third person: 'The servant of God (N) is baptised in the name of,' &c.; that all mention of regeneration is excised; sponsors, other than as parents or guardians, are ignored, and the Lord's Prayer omitted, and that a prayer in which the 'bishop lays both his hands on the head of the baptised person,' appears to be the substitute for confirmation either as understood by East or West, while no ring is to be found in the 'Solemnization of Matrimony.' But we shall be asked by those who believe in M. Ferrette, What are his ordination and consecration services? Surely the prelate who is so wrathfully contemptuous towards Mr. Skinner because no drop of holy oil had touched his head, and who, according to uncontradicted report, is kindly ready to supply all that is wanting in the Archbishop of Canterbury's orders, and whose consecration, according to his own account, took a good hour, will offer something very grand, imposing, and full, not to say Catholic and Apostolic, on this head, though possibly rather lengthy. We are always glad to begin with praise, and so we freely and entirely acquit these portions of M. Ferrette's book of circumlocution. By way of measuring the length of the offices, we have tested the length of each in comparison with a single exhortation (the first) on our own Communion office, and we find that while that contains 547 words, the entire form of the 'Ordination of Deacons or Ministers,' from the first word of the presentation to the 'welcome' with which it concludes, is disposed of in 343 words; the ordination of 'Presbyters or

Elders' in 252, and the 'Ordination of Bishops or Overseers' in 463, neither Lord's Prayer nor lection of Scripture being ordered in any. The Deacon's office, according to the Lord of Iona, is to 'take care of the poor; to administer the property of the Church; and to relieve the bishop of all those matters generally which 'do not exclusively belong to the episcopal order;' and accordingly, while the poor Protestantized Church of England orders the Bishop to place his hands on the head of the postulant, and say: 'Take thou authority to execute the office of a Deacon in the Church of God committed unto thee; in the name of,' &c. the founder of the 'Orthodox Western Church' revealed to the *Union Review Almanack* substitutes this noble form of words:

'The divine grace, ever healing that which is infirm, and supplying the defects of that which is imperfect, promotes the servant of God (N) to the order of deacon. Let us therefore pray for him, that the grace of the All-Holy Spirit may come upon him. Let us pray the Lord.'

The 'Presbyter or Elder' is ordained with a similar form of words, 'Order of the Elder of his people' being substituted for 'Order of Deacon;' only, as the deacon has had every duty attributed to him 'which does not exclusively belong to the Episcopal Order,' the suffragan of the Metropolitan of the World judiciously omits any recital at all of what the 'Presbyter or Elder' has to do. Who that loves his 'Directorium Anglicanum' will not confess to the superiority of this office over the meagre formularies of the old English Establishment, which actually makes the bishop bid the new priest 'receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of hands,' and continues to give the authority of binding and of loosing sins? The similar words *mutatis mutandis* in M. Ferrette's 'Ordination of Bishops or Overseers,' contrast as decidedly with the competing expressions in the old-fashioned Prayer-book. The office of a bishop being, we are told, 'to teach; to baptize; to administer the Lord's Supper; to read the public prayers; to bless; to govern; to bind and to loose; and to ordain bishops, elders, and other bishops.'

We have, we venture to think, exonerated a great and good man from the grievous calumnies of the unrighteous and scornful. Author of such a Prayer-book as the first-fruits of his Episcopate, M. Jules Ferrette was not traitorous to his old Presbyterian employers—nor yet a very dangerous foe to his still older friends of the Papal Church—when he sought clandestine consecration as the pretending bishop of a sham see of Iona, from the schismatic hands of a dubious Metropolitan of the World.

Our readers will have had enough—certainly we have had—of M. Ferrette's liturgy. We should never have dreamed of rescuing the trashy *brochure* from its predestined obscurity, for its own worthless sake; but it demands notice on account of those who are the backers of its compiler. Are they Jacob or are they Esau? Is it venison or kid with which they desire to nurture the English Church? They are professedly and ostentatiously members of the same school which has brought out the second exaggerated edition of the 'Directorium Anglicanum,' and yet we now have them supporting, in the person of its author, this eviscerated Presbyterian caricature of the Catholic Liturgy. With what service do they mean to leave us after all—with the High Mass of the 'Directorium,' or the 'Liturgy of the Lord's Supper' of the Bishop of Iona?

This folly has its serious side, or we should not have gone out of our way to expose it, in the encouragement which it offers to those who see the surest way to working a Puritan or Latitudinarian change in the Prayer-book by bringing into contempt the men who seem to be parading themselves as Reformers in an opposite direction, with whom of course the standard-bearers of the Catholic *status in quo* are popularly confounded. We greatly regret that in his Charge (which contains so much which is good) the Bishop of London should have dropped some expressions which might be taken advantage of by the men who are bonded together to un-catholicize the Church by altering the Prayer-book. It is true that the Bishop guards himself against seeming to favour any change which tended to affect the doctrine contained in the book; and appears in what he said to have his attention chiefly directed to an authoritative explanation of the vestment rubric, or to meddling (a thing gravely to be deprecated) with the Burial Service. We will test the policy of such an alteration upon the principles enunciated by the Bishop himself. The rubric of which it is sought to relieve us—an attempt which never would have been thought of but for the precipitancy of the self-entitled ritualists—confers a theoretic legality by the Church of England upon the adoption at the great crowning act of worship of certain rich and distinctive dresses different from those which are worn at the less important services. These dresses are derived, it may be, immediately by that Church of England from the unreformed mediæval Churches, but they descended to them from the primitive Church. These are dresses which, with more or less of similarity, the Episcopal Churches of East and West with which, thank God, we are still connected by the links of Apostolic orders, have from earliest times agreed in employing, and which are also employed from feelings of reverence by various Lutheran communities abroad. True it is that this permis-

sion to wear these dresses at all has, except in isolated instances, been a merely paper one. But is it not the instinct of all old and great institutions to be wary of abolishing prescriptions, even if apparently obsolete in practice, if they are conservative of some tradition which it would be wrong to formally abandon and explicitly to condemn, or which at some other time may show itself suited for the occasion, and therefore spring again into wholesome life.

But would it then be wrong to abandon, and in abandoning to condemn the tradition of these vestments within the English Church, and to make it impossible that they should ever again become a popular usage?

Let the Bishop of London answer this question.

'To review, then, our present position. We are ministers of a Church which adheres to an ancient Apostolical form of government, not with the tenacity of a narrow exclusiveness, forcing us to look with suspicion and coldness on the great Protestant communities abroad, or on Nonconformists at home. We prize and thank God for this outward bond which—while it is some sort of link, however slight, with the unreformed Churches of our own day, whose errors we deplore and would gladly help in mending—ties us also to the great mediæval Churches, and the noble spirits who in them spread light in the midst of the thickly-gathering darkness of gross error: we feel, too, that it carries us up in outward relationship to the struggling Churches of the fourth and earlier centuries, and the great Fathers, whose writings formed in those days the best literature, not of the Church alone, but of the Empire. It is thus we prize the Catholic element in our own government.'

Memorable words these! especially uttered as they were by one of Bishop Tait's school. But if the endangered rubric were put out of the way, they would be less true and, therefore, less memorable. In a great incident of worship, 'a link, however 'slight,' which connects us 'with the unreformed Churches of 'our own day,' would have been snapped—and our attitude to 'the great Protestant communities' of Scandinavia would become one of 'coldness and suspicion'; one 'outward bond which ties 'us also to the great mediæval Churches' would have been riven, and a prescription 'which carries us up in outward relationship 'to the struggling Churches of the fourth and fifth centuries,' would have been annulled. Why this havoc? Because a few men may have striven to put this dormant enactment in use at a moment when they should have recollected that 'Charity was better than rubrics;' to quote the manly acknowledgment of the author of the earlier and more temperate '*Directorium Anglicanum*,' and because a still smaller set had tried to use the obsolescence of the vestments as an argument to introduce all other things that happened to please them, if only those too were also obsolete.

No doubt the attempt was made to let these vestments down

easily, but rather contemptuously, by the argument used by the Dean of Westminster, that, after all, they were immaterial, inasmuch as they were but the crystallized dress of an ancient Roman peasant. This observation (into the archæological correctness of which we are not entering), so far as it was intended to discredit them, seems to us eminently unphilosophical, for the whole history of the Christian economy abounds with instances of the Church adopting common things, making them her own, modifying them to her needs, and then, when the fashion of the world changes, retaining them with a now hallowed monopoly. As well might the sacredness of the buildings in which we worship be impugned, because they were only the imitations of disused prætors' courts. As well might the Sacraments themselves be disparaged, because 'sacrament' was a word which at first only meant a soldier's oath of fidelity. We can readily believe that some such feelings as those with which we have analysed the Bishop of London's declaration, prompted the Bishops of 1661 to retain the rubric, although we see that the Bishop of S. David's, in his recently published Charge, goes far to charge them with disingenuity for so doing. Besides, the Bishop forgets that in settling the Prayer-book they had to do so not only for parish churches, but also for cathedrals and royal chapels, under one and the same rubric—a rubric propped, in their eyes, by the Canon which *orders* the cope in collegiate churches, and can only by a forced interpretation *forbid* it anywhere; and that any abandonment of the *littera scripta* would imperil that more grandiose cathedral service to which they had been accustomed before the Civil War, and might have reasonably hoped to see restored. Had Charles II. been even moderately fond of the public devotions of the English Church, it can hardly be doubted that his chapel would have been regulated with a solemnity which would probably have at least re-established the cope and other enrichments in the Chapel Royal; as it was, his selfish profligacy, followed by the perversion of his brother, had before the Revolution extinguished that ceremonialist influence which in so marked a way flowed from the Sovereign's chapels during the reigns of Elizabeth and the first two Stuarts. But how could the Bishops of 1661 foresee this?

That with the glowing appreciation of external beauty in the minds of all educated men, with the growth of art in form and colour in all our buildings, the Church of England, if she holds firmly to that improved system of its worship, of which cathedrals like Ely, Lichfield, and Llandaff, and churches like S. Barnabas, and All Souls', Halifax, give the cue, will not do something at the right time to glorify, in accordance with the rubric, the Eucharistic dress, we cannot for a moment doubt, if only she is



left in peace to work out her own improvement. We are, as we have already said, very glad to see that the Bishop of Oxford, in his late Charge, speaks to this effect. Perhaps the present time might have been the opportune one if those who started the development had been as cautious, and law-loving, and genially English in their ways, as some of them are unhappily the contrary. If the development is checked, the reason of the check must be sought at the hands of those who drove it on so recklessly.

A testimony singularly opportune and weighty to this view of the question has reached us from across the Atlantic. The 'ritualistic' controversy has reached the United States, and seems to be agitating those cities in the North in which the Church is powerful. Accordingly, some clergy and laymen, headed by Dr. Dix, rector of the large, wealthy, and influential Trinity Church, New York, memorialised the 'Presiding Bishop,' asking for his 'views of the subject in full: especially as to 'whether an increase of Ritualism would be advisable among 'us, or whether the ordinary average of present parochial 'practice'—which in Dr. Dix's own case is, we believe, the moderate High Church, that for example of S. Paul's Knightsbridge—'would best carry forward the great work of the Church 'in such a country as ours.' The Presiding Bishop to whom this memorial was addressed, is an old man seventy-five years of age, Dr. Hopkins, diocesan of the proud Puritan New England State of Vermont, conspicuous of yore for the strength of his anti-Roman feelings and language. Bishop Hopkins, in reply, set himself to write a book entitled 'The Law of Ritualism, 'examined in its relation to the Word of God, to the Primitive 'Church, to the Church of England, and to the Protestant 'Episcopal Church in the United States,' in which, with no strong recognition of the benefits of the Reformation and of the corruptions of Rome, he examines the question of ritual in the aspects of the dissent of the Christian from the Jewish Church, the practice of the Primitive and the written law of the actual rubrics of the Anglican and Anglo-American Churches; and the result is, that in behalf of the latter and *à fortiori* of the former, while owning his own individual preference for simpler forms, he sums up in favour of the lawfulness, and of the edifying tendency in cases where it is acceptable, of a ritualism involving not only vestments, but incense; and even prophecies that it will ultimately prove the winning side in our Communion. We quote the concluding paragraph of the book.

'Enough has been written, however, and perhaps more than enough, to be a satisfactory answer to the application of my respected brethren. I have only to state in conclusion, that I am an advocate for Ritualism, so far as it is

fairly warranted by the Bible and the law of the Church, and can make its way with the free choice of Ministers and people. It is not likely that I shall bear any active part in it, as my age is too advanced for my habits to be changed. But I have little doubt that my children will behold the "glory and the beauty" of our public worship brought back to the first stage in the Reformation, in accordance with the rule which has never been formally renounced, and still remains in the rubric of the English Prayer-book. And I trust that the work, conducted as it should be, in the spirit of a pure and living Faith, and with the Christian grace of peace and charity, will add attractiveness to the cause of truth, and increase the influence of the glorious Gospel.'

We commend the whole work to that part of the clergy 'in the diocese of London' who have found time to contribute their little share to the cause of dispute and suspicion, by circulating an address in which, while 'not insensible to the objections which may be urged against such voluntary declarations on the part of clergymen who have already made the subscriptions voluntarily imposed upon them,' they announce that they yet 'are convinced in their consciences that the time is fully 'come' (to whom?) 'when, for the satisfaction of the great 'majority of the lay members of the Church of England' (when and by whom polled?) 'and for the vindication of our Church in the eyes of others,' (what others, Romanists, Greeks, Colonists, Jews, or Zulus?) 'some authoritative check should be put to practices,' &c. The memorialists are wisely vague as to the stringency of the check and the authority from which it is to come; a box in the ear is 'some check,' so is hanging a man, but any body of laymen who should set about exposing some brother layman to popular contempt or odium by formally urging that some check should be put on his proceedings, and leaving it obscure whether they implied a snub, a stop, or capital punishment, would be considered more anxious for their own property or safety, than zealous for the repression of the evil-doer. The memorialists continue—'should be put to practices which are 'confessedly introduced and maintained as symbolical of doctrines 'against which our Reformers protested, and in protesting 'against which many of the "noble army of Martyrs" "loved 'not their lives unto the death.'"

How can these gentlemen have the effrontery to say that such practices are *confessedly* introduced as 'symbolical of doctrines' against which Cranmer, Ridley, &c. died, and yet shirk recapitulating any one of them? We have already, not many pages back, given our reasons for thinking that sundry practices which may or may not be used, but which we speak of only as recommended in a certain book, are unwise, nay, possibly, in some cases, more or fewer, alien to the spirit of the Church of England—as alien as preaching in a black gown, administering Communion to whole railfals, ignoring daily

services, Saints' days, and weekly Communions, palavering in public halls and Evangelical Alliances with omnigenous dissenters. But we never dreamed of saying that they were '*confessedly*' as symbolical of that for which Cranmer and Ridley were burnt, for if we had made any such statement we hope some avenger would have risen up to put us to open shame for daring to bring a charge so sweeping, so vague, and yet so damnatory, against the revival—opportune or not—of usages of which the most prominent are urged on the authority of a rubric in a Prayer-book put forth when the two most prominent of this 'noble army of Martyrs,' who 'loved not their lives unto the death,' in resisting them, were respectively Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London. We have no patience to follow this protest through its next paragraph (a useless amplification of the preamble), which is simply a 'solemn protest' against all 'doctrine and ritual' of which 'the tendency is to assimilate the teaching of the United Church of England and Ireland to the teaching and worship of a Church which we have declared to be "idolatrous." ' 'We have declared'—let the memorialists, as Dr. Parr said, mind their pronouns and speak for themselves. When have we done so? We have no doubt asserted that a certain doctrine of adoration of the Sacramental Presence<sup>1</sup> was 'idolatry,' not however even saying that it was a necessary Roman doctrine, but of the Church of Rome itself we had, we thought, only said what we also said of the Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria (*i.e.* the three *primitive* Eastern Patriarchates), viz. that it (the Western Patriarchate) with them 'hath erred not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith.' (Article XIV.) Finally, the declaration, having disposed of the Church in its spiritual aspect, settles its political standing in a brief and pregnant sentence. 'And we declare our conviction that the claim of our Church to be the Established Church of the realm, rests mainly upon her fidelity to the principles of the Reformation.' In our ignorance *we* imagined that these claims rested upon the common law of the land, shaped centuries before there was either a Reformation to check the excesses of Rome, or before those excesses had reached such a height as to create that Reformation, confirmed by the Great Charter, and recognised by Acts of Parliament more than we can count, passed before, during, and after that Reformation.

We have not cast in our lot with the so-called 'ritualists.' On the contrary, we were taken severely to task by their organs

<sup>1</sup> It might clear the minds of the memorialists on this point to recur to certain observations of the Bishop of St. David's in his recent Charge on the term 'Penance.'

for the plainness with which we have expressed our dissent from their aberrations. We feel accordingly more free to make our protest now, not against them but against their accusers, as a body of men who have taken advantage of the follies of those persons, and of the clamour of the journals against them, to bind together 'High-and-dry' with 'Low,' in a protest which might swamp chasuble and censer, but equally, in the vagueness of its vituperation, 'secretly strike at' any 'established doctrine, or laudable practice of the Church of England, or indeed of the whole 'Catholic Church of Christ,' which happened to displease the *Morning Advertiser* or any other 'organ of public opinion.'

To persons other than these memorialists, who think that excessive ritualism ought not only to be checked, but thrown back, we would venture to recall the little damage which was done to the Church of England by that ultra-ritual movement in the early days of the Church revival, of which the foundation was the excessive study which the leaders of the advance-guard at that time bestowed upon the Breviary, of which the keynote was struck in the service for Bishop Ken's day, contributed by Mr. Newman to the 'Tracts for the Times.' It would carry us much too far out of our way now to give a minute account of this peculiar and interesting—and, we believe, now very much forgotten—phase of the movement. It is enough to say that to us, who happened to have seen, without being implicated in, something of its internal working, the present manifestation sounds like the echo of a long-dropped strain. The same extravagant adulation of the foreign and pre-Reformational—the same faith in the sentimental—characterised the two epochs; while in the men who ruled the earlier one, poetry, intellect, and unwavering faith in virtue of the enterprise stood revealed. Well, that laborious pursuit of devotions whose ruling principle was the bountiful use of the Psalter, coloured by suggestive antiphons said with accessories of æsthetic excitement, has died away—some of its most eminent promoters are lost to us; others, with sobered energies, are earnest labourers in our own Church; while, in the general spread of the daily service, we find the good seed saved from that too luxuriant harvest. Bear, then, we say to all sound Churchmen, with the present commotion. A change now will be a change produced, not by conviction, but by force, and therefore worthless, even if it be one which merely restricts the liberty of the present rubric, to forms most generally familiar. We make little distinction between a change by judgment of the Privy Council, or one by Act of Parliament. Neither can be compassed under circumstances which can command abiding respect. The 'ritualist' will be exasperated, the advocate of moderate conformity and sober dignity will be indig-

nant that the opportunity should not have been taken advantage of for screwing up the Puritan, while the Puritan will storm because the general level had not been beaten down, and the Latitudinarian will be generally disgusted by the entire turmoil. To the ritualist, on the other hand, we say as emphatically—he be advised in time, and show the truest courage, that of daring to retrieve a mistake, and in the cause of peace not flinching from the unmeaning reproach of inconsistency.

In strong contrast to that of 1866, the Congress of 1867 will not even be held in a cathedral city. Birmingham was first thought of, but the cold unwillingness of the Bishop of Worcester defeated the proposal: so Wolverhampton, in the more genial diocese of Lichfield, was chosen, upon the invitation of the mayor, and with the promise of the bishop to preside. This large town is so near Birmingham that it will virtually sweep in the same body of local attendants. Wolverhampton, itself as it were the creation of its subterranean treasures of coal and iron, developed by modern science and enterprise, will have nothing about it of that antiquarian picturesqueness which formed so powerful an attraction at Bristol, Norwich, and York. The persons that go there from a distance will be people who wish for a Church Congress in itself, and desire, at some little trouble to themselves, to help it on. This will very probably thin the attendant numbers, but the change will be tonic, because the benefits of such a gathering are those emphatically of influence and information, so long as at a congress formal resolutions are forbidden. Care must be taken, in the long run, not to let the easy and social, nor even the archæological, aspect of the affair, become too prominent. Deliberation with action is one thing; without it, it is another, but still it is deliberation, and should be respected in its given aspects, such as we may expect in the coming instance, for it could not be expected that Churchmen would make a three days' residence in Wolverhampton for any other end than that of mutual counsel.

There is one special aspect in which we think that the choice of Wolverhampton is peculiarly fortunate. There is no cathedral there. York, as we have seen, showed off the cathedral element in our Church in an aspect of spiritual usefulness and majesty which must have surprised many of those who were present. The time had naturally come for the experiment to be tried how much could be done with a parish church in supplying the worship element of a general gathering. For this trial Wolverhampton is peculiarly well adapted. The church there had of old been collegiate, and till lately, while practically only that of a parish, had possessed that titular rank, the Dean of Windsor being *ex officio* also Dean of Wolverhampton. Now we believe this

harmless distinction has been blotted out, and it is only as other spacious town churches. The fabric was rather larger than the average of parish churches, but the choir had been replaced by some hideous abortion of deteriorated Italian architecture. As the church, however, lost in dignity, it regained in beauty; for a restoration of, we believe, a very satisfactory character, including the rebuilding in more seemly form of the choir, was not very long since consummated, under an incumbent who knows well how to work the church which he possesses. So it would be a strange thing if the solemn celebrations and public services, which ought to form essential elements of every Church Congress, could not be provided in this old collegiate church. The question of how to work the parochial system for the best benefit of the people was debated at York, in a discussion where the worship question received due prominence, a most friendly hearing being accorded, among others, to a clergyman well known for his extremely advanced 'ritualism.' At Wolverhampton practice may supplant theory. We venture to suggest that it might be worth while at this, the first congress not held in a university or cathedral city, to superadd, in some form, the choral festival to the congress. The diocese of Lichfield has, since the institution of the Church-music congresses—as we may well style them—been prominent for the zeal with which it has encouraged them, both in the cathedral and in various parish churches. Here, then, at Wolverhampton, when on the occasions of these public days the worship ought to be made all-glorious in a place destitute of capitular resources, the diocese might combine to furnish the means. One special introductory service, and at least one specially solemn Communion, would, we have no doubt, be provided. But even on the other mornings and in the evenings something might be done to honour God in His sanctuary, and withal promote the study of Church psalmody by strongly sustained choral services of a scientific character.

In this union of the outward manifestation of Anglican worship, and in deliberations not inferior, we hope, to those of previous congresses, the usefulness of such gatherings would make itself felt in a region where, from all we know of the growth of Church feeling in the populous towns of great and active Staffordshire, men's minds are very open to wholesome impressions. The Wolverhampton Church Congress might thus be made a pattern of that which we believe the ideal advantages of the institution to be. These are, in brief, the building up of the members of the Church of England, as in no fanatical or exclusive sense, but with all their national characteristics preserved, into a holy people, attached to, understanding, and zealous for that Church to which they belong; not prone to take the offensive;



tolerant and tender of the consciences and rights of others, but ready, at the faintest sound of danger, to stand to her defence; appreciating that, with a very wide liberty of individual opinion, the topics on which all who call themselves Churchmen ought to take unanimous counsel together, are as numerous as they are important; convinced, above all, that in the Prayer-book, as a record of things to be believed, and an exponent of things to be done in God's honour and for man's salvation, is to be found for them the common bond of Christian union, and the common law of the acceptable service due to Almighty God.

---

## NOTICES.

MISS METEYARD'S 'Life of Wedgwood' (Hurst and Blackett) is a refreshing book to meet with; a pleasant island in the sea of worthless so-called Christmas-books and Gift-books with which the literary market is flooded at this season. Few things are more disheartening to the interests of real literature than the accumulated mass of rubbish of this sort: old selections of old scraps of poetry got together without principle and taste; flimsy woodcuts executed by a process of slop-work which is only not worse than block cutting by machinery; silly tales, repeating old incidents, in so far as they have any plot or story at all, and vapid sentimentalism and shabby morality. There was, perhaps, never an age in which there were more books manufactured than at present. Every publisher, towards the close of the year, seems to engage in a rivalry which shall produce the greatest quantity of print at the smallest expenditure of thought; and manufacturers of this sort of ware are as plentiful as journeymen carpenters and shoemakers. Grub Street is more than revived. Now a really good book, full of facts, and with illustrations taken from facts, such as Miss Meteyard's, comes upon us as a surprise. The publishers are to be congratulated on the success which has attended their lavish outlay of capital, and the painstaking authoress has accumulated stores of information and research, which are highly creditable. The only fault of this book is that it is somewhat too copious, not in the memorials of Wedgwood's ingenuity and versatility, but in Miss Meteyard's remarks. We should almost have preferred, here and there, the dulness of a catalogue to the prolixity of her comment. Here and there we find some confusion and occasional repetition; but these are minor blemishes. Wedgwood seems to have been a fine character,—deficient, we fear, in some elements of the highest Christian mould: but the story of his life, especially in the relations of family and of friendship, is an interesting one; and to him we owe the elevation of a manufacture into an art which is one of the few boasts of England in matters of taste. He attained a very high level in one of the most beautiful creations of human skill, and it is a level which since his days we have scarcely kept.

Of a very different character is another striking piece of biography, 'The Life of Archbishop Whately,' by Miss Whately (Longmans). It may be well doubted whether filial piety is the best prompter of biography. What we gain in the large and important field of personal recollection and in the minute yet telling incidents of family and social life, we lose, perhaps, when we have to gain a view of the life of a statesman and ecclesiastic. Personal life may be studied through the medium of a magnifying glass; but the whole landscape of seventy years of public work demands a broader treatment and more general effects. And there was that in Dr. Whately which a very close connexion in blood and daily intercourse would prevent a daughter from seeing. We know better than we ever knew before the higher side of Whately: we owe to his daughter a familiarity with his real kindness, his

personal religion, and his unquestionable sincerity. But a reverent veil is drawn over his defects of character. We are not going to speak of the Archbishop's doctrine or of his ecclesiastical and theological principles : they have been too often adverted to in this Review to require us now to express our emphatic dissent from most of them. But there was that large deficiency in the man which we should hardly learn from these volumes, interesting as they are. Whately was spoilt by his start in life. A public school would have taken the conceit out of him : he would have learned the lesson which can only be learned in youth, that he had his equals and superiors. As it is, we find him as Archbishop repeating the first incident that is recorded of his childish years. He was always 'carrying young ducks to feed on the caterpillars of distant cabbages.' The whole world of thinkers does not consist of young ducks : but Dr. Whately seems to have thought that it was his business always to be carrying everybody in the palm of his hand to take the food which he thought best for them. He was all his life a pedagogue ; and the whole world was his schoolroom. He did not argue with people, he only lectured them. Few minds were more active than his own : but not only was his mind to him a kingdom, but a despotism ; and he worked his despotism through certain satraps—Dr. Hinds, Dr. Dickenson, and a succession of tame chaplains or receptivities. His fidelity to his friends, though it has an occasional ludicrous aspect, was touching ; but we may hint a suspicion that even his energetic partiality must have been dearly purchased at the price of receiving some of the very longest and most dictatorial epistles which are on the records of familiar correspondence. *Nulla dies sine linea*, and no day without setting somebody, or it might be the whole universe, to rights ; and yet it is surprising that, with all his diligence and all his powers of persuasion, if not of oburgation, how little permanent influence Whately possessed. His theology has trickled over current thought, but has not entered into it. He was at Oxford a whetstone, but no knife ; and in Ireland, with the best intentions, he gained nobody, and succeeded in no object of life. Part of his failure must be attributed to his inveterate habit of announcing thoughts which he did not know to be old as his personal discoveries : and part to his roughness of manner and lack of dignity. This, however, was his misfortune rather than his fault ; for a man who, like him, actually lacked the faculty of reverence, and who despised all art, and was constitutionally incapable of the sense of beauty, which he treated more with disdain than indifference, must have been deficient in one of the main elements of human sympathy. And in personal intercourses, checked and redeemed as it was by his essential kindness, his egoism—for it was something better than vulgar egotism—might have been amusing.

Here is another biography, and the force of contrast cannot go much further than the opposite lives of Wedgwood, a clever Unitarian, a Latitudinarian Archbishop, and the great Puritan soldier, 'Stonewall Jackson,' whose 'Life' has been published, in two volumes, by Nisbet. The author is a dissenting professor, Dr. Dabney, who, such were the strange vicissitudes of the late terrible conflict, served on Jackson's staff throughout most of his campaigns. Some allowance must perhaps be made for the biographer's personal views ; and parallel accounts, such as Colonel Von Börcke's volumes, supply that element of geniality in Jackson's intercourse with his fellows

of which the austere Dr. Dabney gives no indication. Jackson, if we are to accept his biography in its totality, was, what Cromwell was not, a really good and religious man according to his lights. How those lights were prevented from settling into the darkness of fatalism only illustrates that merciful inconsistency by which human nature in her last resort always rebels against the conclusions of Calvinism. Stonewall Jackson's creed is indistinguishable from fatalism; but Stonewall Jackson's practice, while it was that of habitual communion with God, neglected none of those means to success which the keen busy energy of his country supplies. He was a Puritan and a predestinarian of the most rigid type, but he never lost a chance, and always slept with one eye open. Dr. Dabney's book is tedious, and not well composed; but, as a genuine record of one of the most remarkable military careers and military characters in history, it stands almost alone.

'Sermons,' by the late Mr. Rickards of Stowlangtoft (Mozleys), forms not only a pleasing memorial of a good, indeed of a remarkable man, and one to whom the readers of this Review are under especial obligations, but is at the same time a good specimen of what village sermons ought to be. Plainness and directness of the sort which Mr. Rickards cultivated require considerable thought and tact; and instruction may be in the best sense of the word homespun without the slightest vulgarity. Homespun is usually solid, and wears well, and Mr. Rickards illustrated his teaching by the fields and scenes of country life; but he addressed himself to what the editor calls 'the latent poetical feeling' of his people with skill, and there can be no skill without effort. It were well that some of our friends bore this more carefully in mind. There is a very dangerous feeling afloat about sermons, and encouraged by those who ought to resist rather than encourage popular howls. The alleged dullness of English sermons is often the result either of irreligious feeling or of that frivolous incapacity to accept sustained thought which is growing upon a half-educated people. It often happens that a preacher receives hints, more or less direct, that he is expected to confine his sermon to a quarter of an hour—ten minutes would be preferred—either to give due effect to an unusually ceremonious service, and to its artistic effects, or because the people have got into a habit of one o'clock luncheons. Add to this, it is becoming the High Church thing always to deliver an extempore discourse; the effect of which loose and flowing talk, considering that the arts of composition and delivery among us are what they are, may, as newspapers say, be more easily imagined than described. In those cases, five minutes of such platitude and unconnected gabble would be too much. We are not saying that the regulation allowance of two sermons on Sunday is net too much of homiletics both to deliver and to listen to; but, on the other hand, we say that every sermon ought to be a work of art and thought,—ought to have a beginning, middle, and end,—ought to convey a lesson with point and definiteness. As it is, the hyper-orthodox, or fashionable, ten minutes of religious maundering has, as the old joke says, one element of immortality—it has neither beginning nor end.

The second part of Mr. J. H. Blunt's 'Annotated Book of Common Prayer' (Rivingtons) has appeared, and the work is in every sense complete. Its only fault is, perhaps, that its aim is too large, for it professes to be a substitute for such writers as L'Estrange, Cosin, and Sparrow, as well as

Wheateley, Comber, and Nicholles; that is to say, it seeks to combine the practical with the exgetical commentator. In these days there are materials for the work which neither the seventeenth nor eighteenth centuries possessed; and not only have the standard works of Palmer, Marshall, and Freeman been laid under contribution, but Mr. Blunt has been able to associate with himself such aids as those tendered by Messrs. Bright and Medd, the accomplished editors of the Latin Prayer Book, and by that erudite and pains-taking collector of materials, Mr. T. W. Perry. *Cuique in sua arte erodendum*. The present editor has given several of the special departments of his work to writers specially qualified in departmental knowledge, so to say: Mr. Macray for bibliography; Dr. Dykes for music; Mr. Walcott for his Cathedralia. We observe that without hesitation the Editor adopts the 'ritual' interpretation of the famous rubric about vestments. It is curious to note that what in his 'Origines Liturgicæ' Sir William (then Mr. Palmer) timidly depicted as certain archaeological curiosities—copes, and chasubles, and mitres—are by Mr. Blunt accepted without hesitation, as though they were the normal every-day accredited and received use. Even Laud and Andrewes would stare and gasp at this development. Handsome and sumptuous in form and full in material, this commentary may justly claim to be the standard one.

Messrs. Rivington have also issued an ornamental 'Prayer Book,' with borders to each page. The typography is beautiful, and the ornamentation good, as far as it goes; but some more variety would have been acceptable. We do not know how far this edition has been collated with the Sealed Book, or whether any of the present editions ever recur to the original text. One thing is certain, that the Thirty-Nine Articles are an unwarrantable addition, for they are not part of the Book of Common Prayer.

We have elsewhere expressed our judgment in full of the so-called, and falsely so-called, 'Eastern Liturgy of the Holy Catholic Apostolic and Orthodox Church,' and the 'Damascus Ritual,' both published by the 'Rev. Jules Ferrette, of Damascus,' who appears in the 'Union Review Almanack for the Year of Grace 1867' (Hayes) as the representative of 'the Orthodox Western Church,' as Bishop of Iona, consecrated in 1866, and as of equal rank and jurisdiction with the Bishops, Anglican and Roman, of England and Scotland. We can only express our regret that the name of a publisher so respectable as Mr. Parker is attached to these discreditable publications.

Some very able and interesting 'Letters from Florence on the Religious Movements in Italy' (Rivingtons), have been published by Mr. Talmadge, who supplied some of them to the *Guardian* newspaper. They contain facts some of which are new to English readers.

We should have thought that the 'Liturgies of 1549 and 1662' had been repeatedly collated and republished in all sorts of parallel arrangements as regards their varieties; but we are indebted to Mr. Orby Shipley for a neat and beautifully-printed reproduction of them, which bears Mr. Masters' imprint.

Von Börcke's 'Memoirs of the Confederate War' (Blackwood), is a sketch written with good taste by a Prussian soldier of fortune, who served on General Stuart's staff, and is written with great modesty and good sense.

It reminds us of Defoe's fictitious 'Memoirs of a Cavalier,' and this is high praise.

'Dr. Austin's Guests' (Strahan) is an odd book. Modelled to some extent on Mr. Warren's 'Diary of a late Physician,' it purports to be the life-histories—we think that is the term—of certain monomaniacs residing in a private lunatic asylum. Whether this form of fiction, founded on the most fearful malady to which human nature is subject, is in good taste, or can be reconciled to Christian discretion, may be fairly doubted; but the collection exhibits powers of writing, and a familiarity with the grotesque, which is sometimes amusing and sometimes offensive.

Mr. Cook, late Inspector of Schools, has published a 'Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles' (Longmans), critical and exegetical, and also devotional, which ought to take high rank. The editor avails himself of things old and new; that is, he goes to patristic, and even to German, authorities.

Messrs. Clark of Edinburgh, those most indefatigable publishers, have commenced a new series, the 'Ante-Nicene Christian Library,' of which the 'Apostolic Fathers' (in one volume) and the 'Apologies of Justin Martyr and Athenagoras' are already out. We have not had time to be able to pronounce upon the fidelity of these translations; but the volumes are certainly edited with care, and that they appear at all, and especially in this quarter, is a curious proof of the extending study of the *origines* of our faith.

From the same publishers we have to acknowledge the second volume of Delitzsch on the 'Book of Job,' and Martensen on 'Christian Dogmatic.' The former work is full, almost to repletion, in its Oriental literature; but it is curious how little the commentator seems to have realized what, in the phraseology of his country, would be called the subjective element. The Book of Job is, apart from its sacred character, the most wonderful, because certainly the most ancient, work of psychological introspection, and while the earliest perhaps the deepest book of meditation on the mysteries of life. Dr. Martensen is not a member of the Church, and seems to survey Christian doctrine *ab extra*, but there is a great deal of matter and material for thought in his volume. While he scarcely seems to have arrived at any very definite conclusions as to objective truth, he seems to consider doctrine as the result rather of philosophical principles than determinate revelation.

But by far the most important of Messrs. Clark's publications is the very handsome and complete edition of Ritter on the 'Comparative Geography of Palestine and the Peninsula of Sinai.' More scientific than Robinson, and, happily, less picturesque than Dean Stanley, the great Berlin geographer Ritter can never be out of date; but it will be a matter of regret that he did not live to complete his great work by availing himself of the discoveries of recent explorers. The present editor, however, has to a considerable extent supplied this deficiency by posting-up his author; and we may say that, among the voluminous products of the well-known Edinburgh press, few exceed this publication in importance and completeness.



## CONTENTS OF NO. CXXXVI.

ART.	PAGE
I.—‘Times’ newspaper Special and Military Correspondents at the seat of War in Bohemia, July and August, 1866...	271
II.—1. Versuch einer pragmatischen Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus nach ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Von Gustav Friedrich Wiggers.	
2. Der Pelagianismus nach seinem Ursprunge und seiner Lehre. Von Dr. Friedrich Wörter.....	290
III.—1. Elegant Extracts; or, Useful and Entertaining Pieces of Poetry, selected for the Improvement of Youth, &c. &c. &c. By Charles Dilly.	
2. Specimens of the Early English Poets. By George Ellis.	
3. Specimens of the Later English Poets. By Robert Southey.	
4. Specimens of the British Poets. By Thomas Campbell.	
5. Introduction to the Literature of Europe. By Henry Hallam.	
6. The Golden Treasury of the Best Songs and Lyrical Poems in the English Language. By Francis Turner Palgrave.	
7. Lectures on English Literature. By Thomas Arnold.	328
IV.—Le Récit d'une Sœur. Souvenirs de Famille recueillies par Mme. Augustus Craven, née La Ferronnays .....	
	353
V.—The Æneid of Virgil, translated into English Verse. By John Conington, M.A. Corpus Professor of Latin in the University of Oxford .....	
	389
NO. CXXXVI.—N.S.	

# CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
VI.—The Communion Office, for the Use of the Church of Scotland, M.DCC.XCII.....	406
VII.—New America. By William Hepworth Dixon .....	429
VIII.—1. The Gentile and the Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ: an Introduction to the History of Christianity. —From the German of John J. I. Döllinger, Professor of Ecclesiastical History to the University of Munich. By N. Darnell, M.A. late Fellow of New College, Oxford.	
2. The First Age of Christianity and the Church. By John Ignatius Döllinger, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Munich, &c. Translated by the Rev. Henry Nutcombe Oxenham, late Scholar of Balliol College .....	459
NOTICES OF BOOKS .....	507